

DISCOURSE
OF THE
Pope's Supremacy.

PART I.

In Answer to a Treatise intituled, *St. Peter's Supremacy faithfully discuss'd, according to Holy Scripture, and Greek and Latin Fathers.* And to a Sermon of *S. Peter, preached before her Majesty the Queen Dowager, on St. Peter and St. Paul's Day,* by *Thomas Godden, D.D.*

By Mr. Stafford, D.D.

IMPRIMATUR. *Liber cui Titulus, A Discourse of the Pope's Supremacy.*

*Junii 7^o
1688.*

*H. Maurice Rmo. in Christo, P.D.
Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. & Sacer.*

LONDON

Printed for Richard Chiswell at the *Sign of the* and Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, MDCLXXXVIII.

N Stafford.

A
DISCOURSE

OF THE

Scripture

PART I

And to a Female Institute, &c.
in the year 1784, &c.
being to the Hon. and Right
Rev. in Christ, And to a sermon
of the year, preached before the Majesty
of Great Britain, on the 1st of March, 1784.
Printed by Thomas Godden, D.D.

PRINTED BY T. GODDEN, A.D. 1784.

Printed by T. Godden, A.D. 1784.

Printed by T. Godden, A.D. 1784.

former of them jointly because there is no Agreement
offer'd in the Sermon, that we do not also agree with
in the Sermon of St. Peter's Supremacy; the first
(which is the first of the three) is the first

DISCOURSE

OF THE

Pope's Supremacy.

THOUGH the Pope's universal Pastorship is a Claim so groundless, and the Vanity of it hath been so exposed, not only by Protestants, but by some learned Men of the Church of *Rome*, that he had need have a *Roman* Confidence, who shall now think to impose upon us, by a pretence so miserably baffled; yet because it is by many still insisted upon with as much Assurance, as if nothing had been said in Confutation of it, it may not be amiss to enquire whether any thing *new* hath been produc'd in defence of this *good old Cause* of the Church of *Rome*, by her late Advocates*.

* Nubes Testi-
um.

St. Peter's Supremacy faithfully discuss'd, according to holy Scripture, and Greek and Latin Fathers. A Sermon of St. Peter, preached before her Majesty the Queen Dowager, by Thomas Godden, D.D. The Pope's Supremacy asserted from the Considerations of some Protestants, and the Prevalence of the Primitive Church; In a Dialogue between a Church-Divine and a Sinner, in Vindication of Nubes Testium.

The first of those Discourses quoted in the Margin, hath already received an Answer; and I think it needless to repeat what hath been said by the learned Author of it. The other three I intend to examine; the two

former of them joyntly, because there is no Argument offer'd in the Sermon, that we do not also meet with in the Treaties of St. Peter's Supremacy; the third (which is a Reply to the Answer to the *Nubes Testium*) shall be consider'd distinctly and apart.

Advertisement to
the Reader.

The Discourse of St. Peter's Supremacy was written (as the Author informs us) in Consultation of some Papers he received from a Protestant Divine: having never seen those Papers, and having great reason upon many accounts to suspect that what he quotes from them is not fairly represented, I shall take no notice of them; but whatsoever I find in his Book that is pertinent to the main Question, and hath but the shew of Argument, shall be duly consider'd. What he hath offer'd, is (he tells us) *as well perform'd as his Abilities would permit*; and his Abilities, we may presume, were none of the meanest, after he had given the Fathers due Discussion, and applied himself to the modern Authors of both sides; that he himself had no low opinion of his Performance, we may reasonably conclude, in that he thought it worthy the Approbation and Protection of her Majesty the Queen Regent; I therefore expected great matters, beyond what I had formerly met with; but no sooner had I read a few pages, but my Expectation flagg'd, and upon the Perusal of the whole Book, I scarce ever found my self more disappointed.

The first Part is wholly spent upon other Points (excepting part of chap. 1. concerning St. Peter's Successor) it being, as he himself tells us, *but Prefatory, and introductive to the main Design he aim'd at*, which in the second Part he applies himself to, and his whole Discourse in the second and third Parts, may be reduc'd to these two general Heads.

Part. 2. chap. 1.

the Pope's Supremacy.

I. St. Peter's Supreme Authority over the Universal Church.

II. That the Bishop of Rome succeeded him in this Supreme Authority.

CHAP. I.

I. **T**HAT St. Peter was invested with supreme Authority over the Universal Church. This is the *Supremacy* he means: a *Primacy of Order* is not denied by Protestants, but that will not satisfy the Pope and his Friends; that which they contend for, is a *Supremacy of Power* over all Christians, not excepting the Apostles themselves. Now that St. Peter had this *Supremacy*, he attempts to prove by several Texts of Holy Scripture, and by the Testimonies of several Fathers, which he quotes as he goes along, to confirm the Sense he gives of those Scriptures.

The Scriptures he produces, he was put to no pains to search for, they being no other than those common Texts, which have, I think, been pressed upon the same Service, by every Romanist that hath ever written upon this Subject, *viz.* *Matth.* 16. *v.* 17, 18, 19. *John.* 21. 16. In the first he supposes that Christ promised this *Supremacy*; in the second, that he conferr'd it.

SECT. I.

I begin with the first, whence he argues, as his Predecessors in this Controversy have ever done, from the
dou-

A Discourse of

double Promise Christ made to St. Peter: The one in these Words, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church*: the other in these, *And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.* But before he proceeds to discourse of these, there are two things he supposes as the reason and Foundation of this special Honour conferr'd on St. Peter †.

† Part 2. c. 1.
23.

First, That at the time when he made this Confession, he alone knew the Divinity of Christ; the rest of the Apostles being as yet ignorant of this great Mystery.

Secondly, That he knew this by a special Revelation from God the Father.

I shall therefore first, examine his Foundation, because if that fail, the Supremacy built thereon, will of it self fall to the Ground.

It hath not without Reason been questioned by some, whether by *the Son of the living God*, St. Peter meant any more than he did by *the Christ*; not only because the former Expression is in other Texts of Scripture expounded by the latter, but because St. Mark, speaking of this very Confession of St. Peter, makes it no more than this, *Thou art the Christ* ||: And St. Luke, that he was *the Christ of God* *: Yea, the Discussor himself supposes, that Peter confessed no more than what Christ afterward *strictly commanded his Disciples to conceal, as too sublime to be divulged* †: And that we find *ver. 20.* was no more than this, *That he was Jesus the Christ*. And if St. Peter's Confession amounted to no more, it cannot then be denied, but that St. Andrew long before him confessed as much, when he said, *We have found the Messiah* ||: And that Nathanael's Confession was no

|| Mark 8. 29.

* Luke 9. 20.

† Pag. 79.

|| John 1. 49.

†

way

way inferior when he said, *Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel* *.

* John 1. 49.

But be it granted, that St. Peter by the *Son of the living God*, meant that he was the Son of God by Nature, (as the Fathers generally expound it) yet that the other Apostles were not at this time ignorant of this Mystery, but knew it as well as St. Peter, will be sufficiently cleared,

First, By Scripture.

Secondly, By what the Discussor himself grants.

Thirdly, By the Testimonies of the Antients. And, as an unanswerable Argument ad hominem,

Fourthly, By the Testimonies of those modern Romaniſts he quotes for the contrary.

First, By Scripture. Of those many Texts that offer themselves, one may suffice, it being so plain and full to the purpose: Many of Christ's Disciples being offended at his Doctrine, they thereupon forsook him; upon this he said to the twelve, *Will ye also go back?* The Question was propounded not to Peter only, but to all the twelve, though Peter alone returned the Answer (as he did to this other Question) *To whom shall we go? Thou hast the Words of eternal Life; AND WE BELIEVE AND HAVE KNOWN, THAT THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD* †. The Discussor grants that St. Peter here undertook, by answering for the rest, to give an account of their Faith ||. Now this Confession is express'd in the very same Words with that under debate, nor doth the Discussor himself deny it to be of the same import. And that of these two Confessions, this in which he grants St. Peter spake in the Name of them all, was first.

Evangelium.

† John 6. 69.

|| Pag. 83.

* *Serm. of St.
Petr. p. 10.*

first in time, Dr. G. hath proved to be manifestly evinced from the Series of the Acts of our Saviour's Life, recorded by the Evangelists:*. And that the said Doctor took this Confession before-made, to signify as much as this latter, of which we dispute, appears by the Question he propounds, and the Answer he returns to it. But why was not St. Peter then presently honoured by our Saviour, with a BLESSED ART THOU SIMON THE SON OF BARJONA? To this, says he, Theophylact answers, That our Lord suspended praising him then (tho he deserved it) lest being at a time when others deserted him, it might seem done out of design, and a piece of Artifice to retain him with him. But Euthymius, says he, more probably thinks it was, because he answered not for himself only, but in the Name of all, among whom there was one so far from being worthy of Praise, that our Saviour presently after, to rectify Peter's Mistake, told them he was a Devil †.

† *Ibid. p. 15.*

|| *St. Petr. Suprem. p. 94.*

It is therefore certain that either the rest of the Apostles at this time knew the Divinity of Christ, or that St. Peter was mistaken in the account he gives of their Faith. The Discussor indeed says, St. Peter committed a great Mistake; and Dr. G. that he found he had been mistaken. But how doth that appear? Because, says the Discussor, Christ told them, that that was not the Belief of all of them, one of them being a Devil ||. And to the same purpose Dr. G. quotes Euthymius. Be it granted that our Saviour excepted one, in that he excepted no more than one, it plainly follows, that all the rest, that is, ten to one, knew him to be the Son of God incarnate. The Conclusion then is unavoidable, that Peter was not the only Apostle, to whom this Mystery was then made manifest.

Secondly,

Secondly, The same Conclusion follows from what the Discussor himself grants: He *dares not exclude the blessed Virgin, nor St. John Baptist, nor the Devils,* from the Knowledge of this Mystery; and he grants, *that Joseph, Zachary and Elizabeth, Simeon and Anna the Prophetes, who were honoured with Revelations and Visions, fill'd with the holy Ghost, and had the Gift of Prophecy, if they did not fully know his Consubstantiality, they had at least some æmuleg æctivas obscure ways of it.* I need not make Reflections upon all these: It will be sufficient to shew, that if *John the Baptist,* and the *Devils* knew it, the Apostles could not be ignorant of it. And,

* Pag. 92, 93.

First, That it follows from the Knowledge of *John the Baptist,* and that several ways.

1. Because *St. John* could not but think himself in Duty bound, to impart this Knowledge to his Countrymen. His Office was to bear Witness of *Christ*; and what more worthy to be witnessed concerning him, than the Divine Excellency of his Person? He was by his Testimony to prepare the way, to dispose Men to believe on him; could he then without Unfaithfulness omit that which above all other Arguments would be of Power to work Faith in them? He who was so careful to confirm his Disciples in the Belief, that he was the true *Messiah* †; can it be supposed, that he would not acquaint them with that, which would above all other things, render them stedfast in this Belief? And if he publish'd this in his popular Discourses, who can imagin that it never came to the Ears of the Apostles?

† Matth. 11.
2, 3.

2. The same is clearly inferred from the means, by which the Discussor supposes *John the Baptist* arriv'd at this Knowledge, *viz.* the Voice from Heaven, at *Jesus's*

B

Bap-

Baptism. *He who heard a noise from Heaven, by a Celestial Herald promulging him to be the Son of God: He who saw the holy Ghost effigiated in the Form of a Dove (that may be question'd) descending from above, and lighting upon him, may very well be imagined to be instructed who he was* ||: If so, may it not as well be imagin'd,

¶ Pag. 92.

that the Apostles might be as well instructed, by the Report of this Noise from Heaven, they received from *John*? May not a Man understand as much by hearing a thing at second hand, (and as firmly believe it too, if he hear it from a Person of unquestionable Credit) as if he heard it at the first? And that *John the Baptist* bear record of this, *St. John the Evangelist* hath told us*: And can any considering Man perswade himself, that the Apostles of our Saviour should be ignorant of that, which the Baptist openly proclaimed to all the Jews?

* John i. 32.

3. *St. John the Baptist* gave yet more pregnant proofs to his Hearers of Christ's Divinity. He bear record, that he was *The Son of God*, by way of eminency, so as never any other Man was, (so *ὁ υἱος τοῦ θεοῦ* with an Article) if this be not thought enough, he loudly testified, that he had a real being, before he was a Man. For *John* cried, *this was he of whom I spake, HE THAT COMETH AFTER ME IS PREFERRED BEFORE*

† John i. 34.

ME, FOR HE WAS BEFORE ME†: In which Words (as a learned Bishop of this Church hath observed) "first, *John* taketh to himself a Priority of time, "speaking of *Christ*, *He that cometh after me*. For so "he came after him into the Womb at his Conception, into the World at his Nativity, &c. 2dly, He "attributeth to *Christ* a Priority of Dignity, saying, "He is preferred before me.— 3dly, He rendereth the "reason or cause of the great Dignity that belong'd to "Christ,

“ *Christ*, saying for, or rather *because he was before*
 “ *me*. As if the Baptist had thus spake at large: This
 “ Man *Christ Jesus* who came in to the World, and entered upon his Prophetical Office six Months after me,
 “ is notwithstanding of far more Worth and greater
 “ Dignity; even so much greater, that I must acknowledge my self unworthy to stoop down, and unloose
 “ the Latchet of his Shoes: And the Reason of this
 “ transcendent Dignity, is from the Excellency of that
 “ Nature, which he had before I was; for though he
 “ cometh after me, yet he was before me.

Pearson on the
 second Article of
 the Creed, p.
 218, 219. of the
 first Edit.

Again, St. *John the Baptist* prefers *Christ* before himself in this, that whereas he himself had his Original from the Earth, *Christ* came from Heaven, and was above all *; thereby signifying that Divine Nature by which he existed in Heaven, before he was conceived in his humane Nature of the blessed Virgin. Can it then be in reason supposed, that the Apostles knew not this Mystery, which *John* so freely publish'd to his Hearers? especially considering, that some of the Apostles were the Disciples of *John*, before they were the Disciples of *Christ*. But,

* John 3. 31.

4. If the *Baptist* knew the Divinity of *Christ*, the *Apostles* we may conclude knew it much rather; since besides what they had heard from *John* concerning it, they had learn'd much more from their Master himself by his private Instructions, and his publick Preaching. Among other things they could not but have observed, that he had frequently discovered Mens secret Thoughts and Reasonings; that he had affirmed himself to be Lord of the Sabbath, and that he had power on Earth to forgive Sins. They had no doubt heard him say, that God was his own Father, and knew that the Jews accused him of Blasphemy for saying so, because thereby

they concluded he made himself equal with God. These and many other matters of the like import they had heard from his own Mouth, of the Truth of which they were abundantly satisfied, by seeing him do such Miracles, which no Man before ever did, in confirmation of what he said. The Argument then lies thus; If *John the Baptist* knew Christ to be *the Son of the Living God*, the Apostles of Christ much more knew him to be so, because they had not only all the same Arguments that he had, but many more from the Words and Actions of Christ himself to assure them of this great Truth.

Secondly, The same Conclusion is as strongly inferred from what the Discussor grants of the Devil's Knowledge, and the ways by which he attained to it. *How the Devils arrived to this Knowledge, Opinions*, he says, *are various*: Three of which he mentions.

The first seems to be of no weight, *viz. That when he was a glorious Angel in Heaven, God revealed to him that his Son should assume humane Nature, and that Man should be exalted to the hypostatic Union with the Word* †. That God revealed this to him, when he was a glorious Angel, there is not the least proof; and in case he did, yet unless he reveal'd also, that this *Jesus of Nazareth* was the Man that was exalted to the Hypostatic Union with the Word, it will not reach the Point to be determined. And he must be a Man of a wonderful fancy who can imagine that this was revealed to the Devil, when he was a glorious Angel in Heaven.

As for the other ways he mentions, the Devil had by them no advantage of the Apostles. For the next opinion he cites, is that of *Theophylatt*, *viz. that the Thief stole this Knowledge from the Voice from Heaven*. And why might not the Apostles also get it the same way? For though they heard not this Voice immediately

† Pag. 93.

ly from Heaven, yet they had the report of it from *John* the Baptist, and as firmly believ'd it, as if they themselves had at first heard it.

The third opinion is that of *St. Austin*, viz. That it was made known to the Devil by the operation of so many Miracles wrought by the Finger of God, which the Devil knew did transcend his, and all Angelical Power.

And in this the Apostles who were Christ's constant Attendants, and the Eye-witnesses of his Miracles, were not inferiour; but if there was any difference, it may be presum'd the Advantage lay on the Apostles side. For tho they knew not how far the Power of Apostate Spirits might reach, and whether some of his Works were such as exceeded their Power to effect: yet there were others of them, (and they the far greater part) that could leave no ground for any such Suspicion, but were such unquestionable Effects of a Divine Power, that all Mankind have concluded, they could be wrought by none but the Finger of God.

If then by these means the Devil came to know the Divinity of Christ, might not all the Apostles as well know it, having the same means of knowing it? Let us now see what was the Judgment of the Ancients in this point.

Thirdly, The same Conclusion is also confirm'd by the Testimonies of many more Fathers, than are alledged by the Discussor for the contrary. He produces three, viz. *Hilary*, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, and *Basil of Selencia*. Let these be yielded to him, what will they signify, when they are over-voted by a far greater Number?

The Discussor himself grants, that the Fathers incidently say, that the other Apostles knew Christ to be the Son

Son of God, before St. Peter's promulging him so: But then he says, they meant thereby his nominal, not his natural Filiation. Let us therefore see whether he truly represents their meaning. He instances only in St. Ambrose, whom he finds in one place to affirm, that the other Apostles knew Christ to be the Son of God as well as St. Peter; and in another to seem to appropriate it wholly to him ||.

|| Pag. 90.

In the one then he roundly affirms, that the other Apostles knew it; in the other he does but seem to deny it. The place, he means, in which he affirms it, is, I presume, in the sixth Book of his Comments on St. Luke, c. 9. Now the Question is, whether St. Ambrose in this place meant, that the Apostles knew the Divinity of Christ, which no Man that impartially reads the Text, can so much as question (and therefore it was wisely done of the Discussor, not to tell his Reader where it was to be found) for St. Ambrose there commenting upon St. Peter's Answer, as it is recorded by St. Luke, *Thou art the Christ of God*, says thus; *If it was sufficient to the Apostle Paul, to know nothing but Jesus Christ, and him crucified; what more should I desire to know than Christ? for in this one Name, is*

* Nam si Paulo Apostolo satis est nihil scire nisi Christum Jesum, & hunc crucifixum, quid amplius mihi desiderandum est scire quam Christum? In pro enim hoc nomine & Divinitatis & Incarnationis expressio, & fides passionis est. Et ideo licet ceteri Apostoli sciant, Petrus tamen respondet præ cæteris Tu es Christus, filius Dei vivi. Complexus est itaque omnia, qui & naturam & nomen expressit, in quo summa virtutum est. Ambros. Comment. l. 6. in Evang. Luc. c. 9. col. 116. Edit. Paris. 1614.

the Expression both of his Divinity and Incarnation, and the Faith of his Passion. And therefore THOUGH THE OTHER APOSTLES KNEW IT, yet Peter answers rather than the rest, THOU ART CHRIST THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD; he therefore comprised all, who expressed both his Nature and his Name.* Can any thing be more plain than ~~that~~ what St. Ambrose here saith, the other Apostles knew, was, what was expressed in the Name Christ, viz. his Divinity and Incarnation?

arnation? And what St. Peter answer'd, when he said, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God*, in which is contain'd both his *Name* and his *Nature*?

So far was St. *Jerom* from thinking the *Apostles* ignorant of it, that he thought the rude Sea-men knew his Divinity, otherwise he spake absurdly in opposing their Confession to that of *Arius* *.

nimias procellas interdum & casu fieri solet, Nautæ atque vectores vere filium Dei confitentur, & Arius in Ecclesia prædicat Creaturam. Hieron. Comment. l. 2. in Math. c. 15. v. 33. Edit. Bas. 1553.

St. *Chrysostom* says, *When Peter said, AND WE HAVE BELIEVED, Christ excepts Judas out of the number of Believers*; thereby plainly signifying, that all of them save *Judas*, believed *Christ* to be the *Son of the Living God*. The same says *Cyrl of Alexandria*.

Add to these all those Fathers who tell us, that *Peter* answered not for himself only, but for all the *Apostles*, which, as *Maldonate* confesses ||, was the Judgment of St. *Chrysostom*, *Jerom*, and St. *Austin*; and *Barradius* cites for it St. *Augustin*, *Ambrose*, *Jerom*, *Anselm*, and St. *Thomas* ||. Yea the Discussor himself tells us, that St. *Jerom* acknowledges, that *Peter did profess this Truth, ex persona omnium*, in the person of them all. That St. *Cyprian* in his 55th Epistle declares, that *Peter answered for all of them*. That St. *Austin* saith, *he only answered to preserve Unity, unus pro multis dedit responsum, unitas in multis, &c.* *

And in confessing this, does he not fairly pull down with one hand, what he labours to build up with the other? For what the reason was, why he answered for all, is not now the question; it suffices, that he did so; since if he did, no Man can reasonably deny, but that he knew what he answered, was the Belief of them all.

* Ad unum signum tranquillitate maris redita, quæ post

† Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ 28 εἶπε καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἠκούσαμεν, ἐξαιρέσει τὸν 29 οὐ τὸν 16 δὲ. In cap. 7. Evang. Johan. Hom. 47.

|| Comment. in Matth. cap. 16. ver. 16.

|| Comment. in Concord. & hist. Evangelic. tom. 2. l. 10. c. 22.

* Pag. 25.

But *this Opinion*, saith the Discussor, reflecting upon Dr. Barrow and Dr. Cave, seemed to me very thin and silly: The reason why it seemed so to him, follows, viz. that Christ should propound a Question to a dozen Persons, which he knew any of them could solve, and make honourable Promises only to him that should speak first, seem'd to me, says he, a childish Fancy, and beneath the Conceptions of a Doctor.

He here forgot his good Friend Maldonate, who was of the same silly Opinion. But is it indeed silly to think, that Christ should propound a Question to a dozen, which he knew any one of them could answer? That Question which just before this he propounded to the same dozen, (*Whom do Men say, that I the Son of Man am?*) did he not know, that every one of them could answer it? and so indeed they all did, or at least so many of them as pleased: That other Question propounded by Christ to all the twelve sometime before this, (*Will ye also go back?*) did he not know, that every one of them could answer it, so far as it concern'd himself? And was not one Answer returned to it by St. Peter, in the Name of them all? as the Discussor himself grants.

But that Christ should make honourable Promises only to him that should speak first, seem'd to him a childish Fancy. But if we may believe St. Ambrose, these honourable

Promises were not made to him only; for what is said to Peter, says he, is said to the Apostles: Or if the Promises were here made to him only, the same were afterward made, and the Reward promised was given to all the Apostles. The Lord saith to Peter, saith St. Cyprian, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church;

¶ Denique audi dicentem, Tibi dabo claves regni Caelorum; & quodcumque ligaveris super Terram, erit ligatum & in Caelo; & quodcumque solveris—Quod Petro dicitur, Apostolis dicitur, Enarratio in Psal. 38.

Church: And I will give thee the Keys.— And although after his Resurrection he gives equal Power to all his Apostles *. Hath Peter received those Keys, says St. Austin, and hath not Paul received them? hath Peter received them, and hath not John and James received them, and the rest of the Apostles †? And that the Promises were made to the other Apostles, as well as to Peter, is not only the Opinion of the ancient Church, (as I shall afterward more fully shew) but of many great Men of the Church of Rome ||.

rorum non vincent eam. Et tibi dabo claves regni Caelorum.—Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, & dicat, sicut misit me Pater, &c. Cyp. de Unitat. Ecclesiz, p. 254. Edit. Paris.

† Nunquid istas claves Petrus accepit, & Paulus non accepit? Petrus accepit, & Johannes & Jacobus non accepit, & ceteri Apostoli? August. Sermon. 30. de Diversis.

|| Elies du pin-de antiq. Eccles. disciplina dissertat. 4. p. 307. Simon vigori ad respons. Synodal. Concil. Basij. Comment. c. 6. & de Monarch. p. 10, 11, 12, &c.

But since the Doctor's Opinion seem'd to him a *childish Fancy*, let us see what *Man-like* Reasons he hath produc'd for the contrary. Peter is said to answer for the rest, not as if he spake or knew their Opinion on this Point. Now what are his Reasons for this? For the Question was asked by our Saviour on a sudden; and it does no where appear that the Apostles had any precedaneous Conference or Consultation about it. Are not these wise Reasons for a Man to give, who had just before censured the Doctor's Opinion as *silly*? Grant the Question was sudden; did the Suddenness of it render Peter ignorant of what he knew (as I have already shew'd) before the Question was asked? Or needed he to consult the Apostles for that Answer, which he had sometime before, upon occasion of another Question, given in their Name? John 6. 69.

Page 87.

But what then was the true Reason, why Peter is said to answer this Question for the rest? Because his Answer thereto was Orthodox, they were obliged to own and

* Ibid.

embrace it, as the common Belief of the Church *. Wiser yet; Is a Man said to answer for all those, who are obliged to own his Answer, because it is *Orthodox*, whether they indeed own it, or not? What if the other Apostles had been *Heterodox*, and disown'd this Answer? Could he then have been said to have answer'd for them? If not, then the reason why he is said to have answered for them, was not because his Answer was *Orthodox*: But if he could, then behold here a compendious way of reconciling all Hereticks to the Church of *Rome*. It is but putting one *Romanist* in the Head of them, and then proposing the Questions in Dispute; for the *Romanist* returning an *Orthodox Answer*, he speaks for them all, and so without any more ado, they are all good *Catholicks*. Had this Expedient been proposed a little sooner, it might have saved the *Bishop of Meaux* and the *Representer* a great deal of needless pains.

He next produces *Jansenius* and *Abulensis* to vouch for him, but (as his manner is) misrepresents them both: *Jansenius* expressly says, that *Peter as the Mouth of the Apostles, answered for them all* †. And again,—*Hence it appears, that he answered for all, which Chrysostom also plainly asserts* ||. And accordingly he is quoted by *Cornelius a Lapide*, *Barradius* and others, for this Opinion. In answer to a Question he proposes we find indeed afterwards, the Words recited by the *Discussor*. The Question is this, *Why Christ now pronounced Peter alone blessed, when all the Apostles, or almost all, seem to have had the same Faith, and when he seemed to have answer'd in the Name of them all?* To which he returns this Answer, *Peter, IF WE SPEAK PROPERLY, did not answer for them all, as he had done, John 6. when his Answer was not so much approv'd, as corrected by Christ;*
but

†—Tanquam o
Apostolorum
pro omnibus
respondet, di-
cens, tu es, &c.
Comment. in
Concord. E-
vangel. cap. 67.

||—Hinc enim
apparet ipsum
pro omnibus
respondisse,
quod aperte
etiam Chryso-
stomus asserit,
&c. ibid.

but professed his Faith for himself, as one that could not know the Faith of others, because he could not search the Secrets of the Heart, &c. * If this seems to contradict what he says before, I leave it to the Discussor to reconcile him to himself. In the other Passage of *Jansenius* he leaves out the most material part; he thus recites it, *Cum Chrysostomus & alii eum vocant Os, & nomine omnium respondisse; non sit accipiendum, quasi responderit id quod omnes sentirent, sed quia solus responderit quod omnibus respondendum fuisset* †. Whereas *Jansenius* his Words are these, *Quod autem Chrysostomus & alii nonnunquam dicant Petrum fuisse Os Apostolorum, & omnium nomine respondisse, non sic accipiendum, quasi id responderit quod omnes sentirent, sed quia CUM OMNES INTERROGATI ESSENT, ipse solus responderit, QUOD OMNES SECUM AUT PENE OMNES SENTIRE PUTABAT; & quod omnibus respondendum fuisset*. Who may not now see, that the Words he hath left out, do plainly contradict that for the Proof of which he brought the rest?

He yet more grossly abuses *Tostatus*: For he says not absolutely, *pro se solo respondit*; but delivers it as a matter doubtful: For as much, says he, as it does not appear determinately, whether Peter answered in the name of all, IT SEEMS thence more agreeable to the letter, that Peter answer'd for himself alone †. For which he gives four reasons, which may be all easily confuted. And a little after, IT SEEMS this is to be said, that Peter now answer'd for himself alone ||. But in case he answer'd for himself only, as *Tostatus* thought, yet he peremptorily determin'd, that he said no more than what they all believ'd, and that every one of them would

* Ex quibus etiam patet, quid ad secundam Questionem Principalem sit respondendum; nimirum Petrum si proprie loquatur, non respondisse pro omnibus, &c. ibid.

† pag. 88.

† De secundo dicendum, quod determinare non constat, an nomine omnium Petrus responderit, unde videtur magis convenire literæ, quod Petrus pro se solo responderit. In Matth. cap. 16. Quæst. 57.

|| Dicendum videtur, quod Petrus pro se solo nunc respondet, ibid.

have said the same, had every one answered singly for himself (as shall presently more fully appear.)

* Pag. 88.

It follows *: *If the other Apostles did equally* (whether equally or unequally is not now the Question) *know it with Peter, and he only spake their Sense for them, I shall with Maldonat ask this Question; What Question? Si pro omnibus Petrus loquebatur, cur non omnibus dictum, Beati estis? Cur non omnibus mutata nomina? cur non omnibus dictum, Vobis dabo, &c.* Is all this but one Question? Another Man would have made it three, without the &c. and whosoever consults Maldonat will find, that that contains one, if not two more, viz. *Cum omnes Christus interrogasset, cur non omnes responderunt? praesertim, cum paulo ante interrogante eo quem se homines esse dicerent, non solus Petrus, sed omnes, aut quicumque voluerunt, responderint* †. Though the Questions are many, yet a few words may suffice in answer to them all.

† Maldonat
Comment in
Matth. 16. Col.
350.

Quest. 1. Why was it not said to them all, Ye are blessed?

Ans. Because Peter alone had spoken for them all, therefore to him alone Christ's Reply is directed. But that it was applicable to them all is manifest; because the reason of it (*for Flesh and Blood hath not revealed it unto thee*) agreed to them all equally, (as I shall presently shew.)

Quest. 2. Why were not all their Names changed?

Ans. Peter's Name was not now changed, but long before; and therefore this Question stands upon a false Foundation. He did not, as St. Austin tells us, then receive this Name, when Christ said to him, *Thou art Peter*; but then rather, when it was said to him, thou shall be call'd *Cephas*, which is interpreted *Peter*, &c. || Or, if you please, I will answer it by another Question.

|| De Consen-
su Evangelist.
lib. 2. cap. 17.

tion. Whether his Name was changed to *Peter*, because the other Apostles did not know *equally with him*, That *Christ* was the Son of the living God?

Quest. 3. Why was it not said to them all, I WILL GIVE TOU THE KEYS?

Ans. This hath been answered already.

Quest. 4. Since Christ put the Question to them all, why did they not all answer it? Especially considering that a little before, when he asked them, WHOM DID MEN SAY THAT HE WAS? not only Peter, but all the Apostles, or as many of them as pleased, return'd an answer.

Ans. I answer in the Words of *Gaudentius*, When *Peter* alone speaks, the Faith of the rest of the Believers is by no means excluded; but a meet order is kept, while the first place is deservedly given to the Prince of the Apostles; lest it should seem a sort of Tumult, rather than an Answer, had they all answered together, or striven which should have answer'd first*. And the reason why all, or many of them answer'd to the other Question, was, because they had a different Answer to return to it; one, one thing; and another, another thing, according to the different Opinions they had heard of the People. I proceed now,

* Solus ergo cum loquitur Petrus, nequaquam reliquorum credentium fides excluditur; sed congruus ordo servatur,

dum Principi Apostolorum primus loquendi locus jure deferatur, ne tumultus quidem magis quam responsio videretur, si tunc universi certatim ac pariter respondissent. Tractat. quem prima die Ordinavit. ipsius quorund. Civ. Not. exceperunt. B. P. P. tom. 4. p. 826.

Fourthly, To the Testimonies of those modern Romanists, the Discussor quotes for the contrary Opinion. They are three, *viz. Toftatus, Maldonat, and Jansenius*. The two former of which, though they deny, that *Peter* answered in the name of all the Apostles; yet they as plainly express, as ever any Protestant did, that the other Apostles had the same Faith, and in case they had spoken

spoken, would have return'd the same Answer, that Peter did.

† Primum est, an id quod Petrus respondit, crederent ceteri, & illud responsum essent, si oporteret respondere? In Matth. 16. Quæst. 57.

¶ De primo dicendum, quod necesse est dici omnes tenuisse eandem confessionem quam Petrus; & si sigillatim Christus vota eorum scrutaretur vel peteret; idem singuli responderent, ibid.

* — Prævenit Petrus ceteros, & dixit quid sentiebat; ceteri vero videntes, quod Petrus dixerat id quod illi dicturi erant, tacuerunt, &c. ibid.

† Cum vero dixit Cyrillus prævenit Petrus ceteros, fitque os totius Collegii. Dicendum, quod fuit os totius Collegii, non quidem loquendo pro omnibus, sed loquendo id, quod omnes locuturi erant; quia accidit eandem esse sententiam Petri et ceterorum, ibid.

in answer to a Passage of Cyril, *When Cyril said that Peter prevented the rest, and was the Mouth of the whole College; it must be said, that he was the Mouth of the whole College, not in speaking for them all, but in speaking that which they all would have spoken; because it happened that the opinion of Peter and the rest of the Apostles was the same*†.

Maldonat having before confessed, that some ancient Authors, viz. St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Augustin, thought that Peter answered not for himself alone, but for all the Apostles; to refute the opinion of the Calvinists (that is the opinion of these Fathers) he proposes those Questions I have before answered; and then adds, *Therefore all other Authors thought ber-*
ter,

ter, that Peter answered for himself only; not that the other (Apostles) did not believe the same thing, and would not have said it, if Peter had not prevented them; but that Peter by a stronger Faith, first broke out into Confession ||. But then lest the Calvinists should have the Honour of having these famous Fathers, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerom, and St. Austin on their side, the Jesuit adds, *And this only is that which these Authors would signify, who have said, that he answered for them all, and who have call'd him the Mouth of the Apostles* *. That is, he is said by them to answer for them all, because having a greater Faith, he first burst out into that Confession which they would have made, had not he got the start of them. Which is a manifest Contradiction to that reason the Discussor gives, why the Fathers say, he answered for them all.

From this passage of *Maldonat*, I shall observe three things. 1. That *Maldonat* makes these two to be distinct Propositions, which the *Discussor* confounds, viz. (1.) That *Peter* answer'd for them all. (2.) That what *Peter* answer'd was the Faith of them all. The first of these he denies; the second he grants. 2. The Questions propounded by *Maldonat*, to overthrow the first of these Propositions, the *Discussor* produces, as if he had designed them, for the Confutation of the second Proposition; which is a notable Instance of his Sincerity. 3. Since *Maldonat* also thought, that Christ in these Words, *Upon this Rock, &c. promised something great and singular to Peter as a Reward of his Confession* †. He thought it

|| Melius ergo omnes alii senserunt Auctores, Petrum pro se uno respondisse; non quod alii idem non crederent, ac dicturi etiam fuissent, nisi Petrus praevenisset; sed quod Petrus majore fide in Confessionem primus eruperit. Comment. in March. 16. v. 18.

* Atque hoc tantum indicare Auctores illi voluerunt, qui dixerunt illum pro omnibus respondisse, quique cum os Apostolorum appellaverunt, ibid.

† Præterea cui dubium est, Christum his verbis, aliquid magnum et singulare, tanquam fidei confessionis præmium Petro concedere aut promittere voluisse? ibid. col. 349.

- no childish Fancy, and beneath the conceptions of a Doctor, that Christ should propound a Question to a dozen persons, which he knew any of them could solve, and make honourable Promises only to him that should speak first.

To these cited by the Discussor, I shall add a few more, whose names are famous in the Church of Rome. The other (Apostles) says Salmeron, had the same Faith, otherways they themselves would have declared their Faith, and Christ would have asked and rebuked them, and would not have commanded them all to keep Silence ||. He is said to have answered for the rest of the Apostles, says Barradius, because he answered first, what they would have answered *. Peter (saith Tivinus) as he was first constituted by Christ in the College of the Apostles, so surmounting the rest in Dignity and Zeal, nothing doubting, as well IN THE NAME OF THE REST, as in his own Name, as the MOUTH OF THEM ALL, He presently, most plain-

¶ Alii tamen eandem fidem habebant; alioqui et ipsi depromerent suam fidem, et Christus quæreretur et increparet eos, et non præciperetur omnibus ut tacerent. Salm. tom. 4, 3. a parte tractat. 1. pag. 383.

* Dicitur tamen pro cæteris Apostolis respondisse, quia quod illi fuerant responsuri, responderet primus. Comment in Concord. Hist. Evangel. Tom. 2. l. 10. c. 22.

† In Matth. 16. v. 16.

ly and boldly answered, THOU ART CHRIST, &c. †.

What shall we say, if Bellarmine himself asserts, that the other Apostles knew this Mystery, as well as Peter? So he plainly does: For in answer to an Objection of Illyricus he says thus, The Faith or Confession (viz. of Peter) may be considered two ways; either absolutely in it self, or with relation to Peter. The Adversaries seem to resolve his Faith to be the Foundation of the Church the first way, but they are certainly deceived; for if it were so, the Lord would not have said, Upon this Rock I WILL BUILD, but I DO BUILD, or I HAVE BUILT my Church. For many had already believed, that he was the Son of the living God; as the ancient Prophets, the blessed Virgin, Simeon, Zacharias, John

the

the Baptist, THE APOSTLES, AND OTHER DISCIPLES ||. I know Bellarmine afterwards makes it one of Peter's Prerogatives, that he alone knew this Mystery by a peculiar Revelation *. But who can help it, if he contradicts himself ?

|| Respondeo, fidem five confessionem duobus modis posse considerari ; uno modo abso-

lute, secundum se, ac sine relatione ad Personam Petri ; altero modo cum relatione ad Petrum &c. de Rom. Pontif. l. 1. c. 10.

* De Rom. Pontif. l. 1. c. 19.

But what shall we say, if the Discussor himself grant, what he so stoutly denies ? viz. That the rest of the Apostles knew Christ's Divinity. This I think he does, in going about to prove that they did not equally know it with Peter †. For to say that they did not equally know it, plainly implies that they indeed knew it.

† Pag. 88.

It is also observable, how wisely he says ; Now if the other Apostles did equally know it with Peter, and he only spake their Sense for them. As if he could not speak their Sense, unless they not only knew it, but equally knew it with him : And as if to speak their Sense, were the same thing, as to answer for them. For though he could not answer for them, unless he spake their Sense ; yet he might speak their Sense, though he did not answer for them, as Tostatus, Maldonat, Salmeron, Barradius, &c. have determined.

His distinction of nominal and natural Filiation ||, hath been already considered, and also his Quotations out of S. Ambrose. Of the rest of the Fathers, whom he finds acknowledging, Peter first to know, and first to confess Christ's Divinity * ; there is not one of them, except St. Hilary, who says, That he first knew it ; but only, that he first confess'd or publish'd it ; and in saying, that he first confess'd it, they imply, that the other Apostles knew it.

|| Pag. 90.

* Pag. 91.

I have said enough, yea too much to expose the vanity

nity of this first Conceit. The prime foundation therefore being raz'd, the other which depends upon it, falls of it self. However I shall bestow a few Lines upon it, that the Discussor may not pretend that he is not answered.

S E C T. II.

The second ground he lays of St. Peter's Supremacy is, That he knew Christ's Divinity by a special Revelation. *For tho Peter's Confession did exceed that of others, yet this, says he, was not the sole reason of his Preferment and Honour; but because the Father singled him out of the Apostolick Society, illuminating him with a particular Revelation, &c.* † And again, *The Father and the Holy Ghost cull him out of the whole Body of the Apostles, and honour him particularly with a Revelation* ||. And again, *I will never be induc'd to believe otherwise, than that St. Peter's Revelation did discover to him more than either what he or they knew before, otherwise it had been of no import* *. And so again and again, as if he thought he could make up what was wanting in proof, by the frequent and impertinent repetition of it.

† Pag. 80.

|| Pag. 81.

* Pag. 90.

I know not any that would induce him to believe otherwise, than that God revealed this to St. Peter; that this Revelation discovered to him more than what he knew before; *that all the forces of Man's Wit, all human Wisdom, Industry and Sagacity, could never have arrived to it, without a Revelation.* Nothing of this is the matter in dispute; but whether this Revelation was peculiar to Peter. And,

1. I have already shewed, that it was not so, by proving that his fellow-Apostles knew the same thing, and by consequence had the Revelation of it as well as he.

he. And whereas he says, we may find the Fathers assert this, by the following Quotations. Therefore,

2. I have carefully read over all those Quotations, and cannot find, that so much as one of the Fathers quoted, assert it: They say indeed, that *Peter* had it by Divine Revelation, which is no more than our Saviour plainly tells us; But they do not say, that he only had this Revelation, or use any such Words as exclude the other *Apostles*. I shall instance in two or three of his Quotations, that the Reader may see how pertinent they are. *Peter was declared blessed, having spoken the things of God* †. Is not this much to the Purpose? Again, he pronounces *Peter* blessed, because he received his Knowledge from the Divine Grace. And is not this every-whit as much? Once more; *As the Prince of the Apostles witnesseth, who was thought worthy to be proclaim'd blessed, because the Father revealed it to him*. But is it said, the Father revealed it to none but him? The Discussor perhaps may say, this is imply'd, though not expressed. How so? because they mention *Peter* only. The reason of that is, because our Saviour directed his reply to *Peter* only; and there was good reason why he should do so, though he meant it to the whole Company, because *Peter* alone had return'd the Answer to his Question; but as he answer'd not for his single self, but for them all, so Christ's return to him, must be extended to all. For since they all knew it, (as has been prov'd) and since they could no other way attain to this Knowledge than by Revelation, it might therefore as truly be said to *James* and *John*; *Blessed art thou James, and blessed art thou John, for Flesh and Blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven*. And,

3. This is no more than what *Origen* plainly asserts.

|| Tract. 1. in
Matth. 16.

If this saying, [I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven] be common to the rest; why shall not likewise all those things be common to all, both which are spoken before, and which follow after, as spoken to PETER ||? Of the same Judgment must all those Fathers before-mention'd be, who were of Opinion, that the other Apostles had the same Faith, and would have made the same Confession, had not *Peter* prevented them. For since they knew, that this Article of our Faith could not be known, but by Divine Revelation; they must of Necessity hold, that all they that knew it had such a Revelation of it. To which I may also add, All those who affirm that the Promise of the Keys was made not only to *Peter*, but to all the Apostles, which (as I shall afterward shew) was the general Opinion of the Fathers.

I might here fairly dismiss the Discussor, for his Foundation failing, whatsoever is built upon it must of it self tumble down. And were indeed both his Suppositions true: Were it true, that the other Apostles were ignorant of Christ's Divinity, and that *Peter* attained to the knowledg of it by a particular Revelation; yet he must be a Man of rare Art, who can superstruct his Supremacy upon such a bottom. For what connection is there between these two Propositions, *Peter* first knew the Divinity of Christ by special Revelation, therefore *Peter* hath supreme Jurisdiction over the Universal Church? Is not this Consequence altogether as good, *Andrew* knew him to be the Messiah before *Peter*, therefore *Andrew* was *Peter's* Superior? And this is somewhat better, St. *John* lay in Christ's Bosom, or had the uppermost place next after Christ at Meals, therefore St. *John* is the Prince of the Apostles? Are not these admirable Consequences? And yet I fear we shall find no better proofs for *Peter's* Supremacy. But

But because some perhaps may say, It is not much material whether these Hypotheses stand or fall, since the direct Proofs he afterwards produces, both from Scripture and the Antients, are a Foundation that can never be shaken; I shall proceed to examine the remainder of his Discourse, though not in his preposterous Method. It is an absurd thing to talk of the Pope's Supremacy, as *St. Peter's* Heir, unless *St. Peter's* Supremacy be first made out; I shall therefore begin with that, and in case it appear, that *St. Peter* was invested with this paramount Power, it will then be fit to enquire, whether it descended to the Bishop of Rome as his Heir.

The Proofs he produces of *St. Peter's* Supremacy are (as I said before) no other than those two Texts of Scripture, commonly press'd by the Romanists to serve in this cause, and the Sayings of some Fathers to confirm the sense he gives of these Texts. In the first of these (*viz. Matth. 16. 18. 19.*) he fancies he is furnished with a double Argument; one from these Words, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church*: The other from these Words, *And to thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, ver. 19.

CHAP. II.

HE first insists upon these Words, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church*: Upon which he bestows three Chapters. In so long a Discourse upon a *Rock*, one might well expect to find something at least of *solid* reasoning; but alas the whole,

†

from

from the beginning to the end, is so sandy, so incoherent and insequent, that I am at a great loss to find any thing that does but look like an Argument. For if at last all should be granted to St. Peter, that he would hence infer, it will in no wise conclude that Sovereign Dominion he contends for; as will plainly appear by taking a survey of his 4th, 5th and 6th Chapters.

S E C T. I.

He grants that *Christ is the primary and principal Foundation of the Church, on whom not only every true Christian, but the Apostles and St. Peter himself is mystically superedified* *; (by the way, were not the *Apostles* and *St. Peter* true Christians? If they were, does not the Discussor speak absurdly, when he says, *Not only every true Christian, but the Apostles and St. Peter himself*, as if they were not included in the number of true Christians) Need he have quoted *St. Austin* and *St. Cyril* for this? Was it ever denied by Protestants? Nay does he not say, that Protestants *traduce* them, as if they went about to *despoil our Saviour* of this Honour? But when he in his reading in the Fathers, he produces their Testimonies for what we affirm, as well as for what we deny. He might also have spared his pains in proving, that *things subordinate combat not one with another*, but suppose one another †; were it not, that we should not then have seen his Learning in the distinction of *fundamentum æMo*, and *fundamentum ærepov*.

* Chap. 4.
Pag. 100.

† Pag. 101.

But lest his liberal Concessions to our *Saviour*, should seem to derogate from *St. Peter's* Glory, he puts in this caution to secure it, That *Peter is not hereby excluded*, (by no means, for then the *Pope* is excluded too) *but is likewise the Rock, but in Subordination and Inferiority to Christ* ‡.

Christ ||. And this also, if it will please him, is granted by *Protestants*; and therefore he is uncivil to the Fathers, in summoning them again to bear Witness to it. But though he cites the Fathers to no Purpose, it may not be impertinent to note two things from those here cited.

1 *Ibid.*

* *Pag. 103*

1. He quotes, *Tertul. Lib. contra Marc.* * as if it were but one single Book; whereas *Tertullian* hath written five Books against *Marcion*, each of them consisting of a great Number of Chapters. As exact is he in the Words cited. *Tertullian* enquiring the reason, why *Simon*'s Name was changed to *Peter*, his Words are these; *Sed & cur Petrum? Si ob vigorem fidei, multa materia solidaque nomen de suo accommodarent. An quia & Petra et lapis Christus? Siquidem et legimus positum eum in lapidem offendiculi et in Petram scandali; omitto cetera. Itaque affectavit carissimo Discipulorum de figuris suis peculiariter nomen communicare* †. Which he thus recites: *Christus Petrum ita vocat, quia lapis & Petra ipse est, itaque affectavit carissimo discipulorum de figuris suis peculiariter nomen communicare.* But I presume he took it upon trust, and therefore may be excused.

† *Advers. Marc. l. 4. c. 13.*

2. Three of the four Fathers he quotes, give a reason of this name, and the reason given by two of those three, is as applicable to the other Apostles, as to *Peter*. So is that of *St. Austin*, *Consortium meretur nominis, qui consortium meretur et operis.* And so is that of *St. Ambrose*, *Recte quia Petra Christus, Simon nuncupatus est Petrus, ut qui cum Domino fidei societatem habeat, cum Domino habeat et nominis Dominici societatem.* Now since the reason they give of it, is common to them all, we may hence reasonably conclude, that they thought this illustrious Title, as truly applicable to the other Apostles, as to *St. Peter*.

But

But one thing I may not omit, lest the *Discussion* should think it unanswerable. Upon a Quotation out of St. Basil, Hom. 28. de Penit. to shew, that Peter's being the Rock, doth not exclude Christ from being so, he makes this Remark. 'Tis very observable here, that this Father acknowledges Christ, to have made the other Apostles LIGHTS, SHEEP, and PRIESTS; but he mentions but ONE ROCK, WHICH IS PETER. This Criticism, he adds, may be observed in St. Ambrose, lib. 6. Luca; Ego sum inquit lux Mundi, &c. And St. Jerome likewise accords herein in his Comments on Abdi-
as, &c. *

|| P. 103, 104.

* Pag. 104.

It is pity this critical Observation should be lost, and yet who can help it? for when these Fathers in the places quoted, express Rock and Disciple in the singular number; as he made a Rock, says St. Basil †. He denied not to his Disciple the favour of that Name, says S. Ambrose ||. And the Rock gave to Peter, that he should be a Rock, says St. Jerom*. The utmost they can mean, is no more than one of these two things, or both together: 1. That these words, Upon this

† Πέτρα ἦν Πέτρον μόνον.

|| Petra erat Christus, etiam Discipulo suo hujus vocabuli gratiam non negavit. Comment. lib. 6. in Evang. Luc. c. 9. tom. 3. col. 117.

* Ipsa Petra donavit Petro, ut Petra fit. Comment. in Abd.

Rock, were directed in particular to St. Peter. Or, 2. That this Title (Rock) was given to him as his proper Name, though as to its meaning, it might be as truly ascribed to the other Apostles. For so far was St. Ambrose from denying that the other Apostles were Rocks, that within two lines after the words quoted by the Discussor, he supposes that every Christian may and ought to be a Rock, for the same reason as St. Peter was. For having said that Christ gave him this Name, because he had from the Rock solidity of Constancy and firmness of Faith, he adds, 'Therefore do thou endeavour that thou also

also mayst be a Rock; therefore seek the Rock not without thee, but within thee †. But to have added this, would have defeated his design in quoring the rest. St. Jerom expressly says in the plural Number, *That Christ is the Rock, who vouchsafed to his Apostles also, that they should be called Rocks,* saying, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church* ||. Where from these words, *Thou art Peter, &c.* he infers, that Christ the Rock bestowed not only upon Peter, but upon the other Apostles, that they should be called Rocks. What is now become of this *Observable*?

We may without danger grant that Exposition of St. *Austin* he contends for *; and therefore have no reason to *court him cap in* * P. 104, 105. hand for the other. But when he says, that *by his varying from his former frequent Explication he deviated from St. Ambrose who baptised him*; he says not true, if the Comments upon the Epistles be St. *Ambrose's* which the Discussor quotes as his; for he there expounds the Rock to be the Confession of the Catholick Faith made by *Peter* *, which is in effect to expound it of Christ. But I grant those Comments to be none of his. Whether St. *Austin* changed his former Exposition upon a Mistake; or whether he were no good *Hebrician* ||, is not here pertinent to be enquired. In what sense he calls *Peter* Head of the Church, shall be afterward shewed. That in most perspicuous terms he acknowledges in several places of his Writings *PETER's SUPREMACY**, has not so much as shadow of proof in any of the places produc'd by the Discussor.

E

But

† *Petra est Christus, etiam Discipulo suo huius vocabuli gratiam non negavit, ut et ipse sit Petrus, quod de Petra habeat soliditatem constantiz fidei firmitatem. Enitere ergo ut & tu Petra sis: itaque non extra te sed intra te Petram require &c.* Ambros. lib. 6. in Evang. Luc. c. 9. col. 117. Edit. Parii. 1614.

|| *Petra Christus est, qui donavit Apostolis suis, ut ipsi quoque Petre vocentur: Tu es Petrus, et super hanc Petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam.* Comment. lib. 3. in Amos. c. 7. v. 12. tom. 6. pag. 102. Bas. 1553.

* Unde dicit Dominus ad Petrum, Super istam Petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam, hoc est, in hac Catholice Fidei confessione statum fideles ad vitam. Comment. Epist. ad Ephes. c. 2. Tom. 3. col. 498.

|| Pag. 106.

* Pag. 107.

But St. *Austin* declares them *Wretched, and Hereticks* that disown him to be the Rock: Thus *Agon. Christ.* he calls them *miseri, dum in Petro Petram non intelligunt.* This is grossly to abuse St. *Austin*, had he considered either the Words that go before, or that follow those he hath cited, he might have seen that St. *Austin* could not by the *Rock* in this place mean *Peter*; for he tells us just before, that *Peter sustains the Person of the Church, and that the Keys are given to the Church, when they are given to him.* To the same purpose are the words that immediately follow †. Now could he bear the Person of the Church built upon the Rock, and at the same time be the Rock it self upon which it is built? St. *Austin* therefore by the *Rock* meant *Christ* himself; and by *Peter* the Church of *Christ*, as he plainly expresses himself in other places. *This Name Peter*, says he, *was imposed upon him by Christ, that by that figure he might signify the Church; for because Christ is the Rock, Peter is the Christian People* ||. Again, *The Rock was Christ, upon which Foundation even Peter himself is built; for other Foundation can no Man lay, besides that which is laid which is Christ Jesus.* The Church therefore which is founded in *Christ*, received from him the *Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven* in *Peter*, that is, the power of binding and of loosing Sins. For that which properly the Church is in *Christ*, that by signification is *Peter* in the

† De Agone
Christiano, c.
30, 31.

|| Serm. 13. de
Verb. Dom. se-
cund. Matth.

* *Petra erat Christus, super quod fundamentum etiam ipse edificatus est Petrus; fundamentum quippe aliud nemo potest ponere præter id quod positum est, quod est Christus Jesus. Ecclesia, ergo quæ fundatur in Christo, &c. Tractat. 24. in Evang. Johannis.*

Rock; **BT WHICH SIGNIFICATION CHRIST IS UNDERSTOOD TO BE THE ROCK, PETER TO BE THE CHURCH***. And that this was St. *Austin's* notion of the Rock in this place, will farther appear if we consider the Scope of his Discourse, which was to prove that remission

of

of Sins is to be obtained in the Church. Let us, says he, not hearken to them, who deny that the Church of God can remit all Sins. Then follow the words quoted by the Discussor, *Therefore those wretched Persons, while in Peter (that is, the Church) they do not understand the Rock (that is, Christ) and will not believe that the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are given to the Church, they themselves have lost them* †. They themselves have lost the Keys, because they will not believe that they were given to the Church. And why will they not believe this? because in the Church they do not understand Christ in whom the Church is founded, who hath committed the Keys to her.

† Nec eos audiamus qui negant Ecclesiam Dei omnia peccata posse dimittere. Itaque miseri, dum in Petro Petram non intelligunt, et nolunt credere datas Ecclesie claves regni Cœlorum, ipsi eas de manibus amiserunt. De Agone Christiano. c. 31.

The next Passage is quoted out of St. *Austin contra 5 Hæres.* I suppose he means his *Oration de quinque Hæresibus*, in which there is no such Passage, and in case it were, it would be altogether as impertinent as the former.

But that which comes next, he is confident *must gag us, and make us as silenced Ministers, as if the Wolves had first seen us*, viz. that St. Austin makes the Succession of the Bishops of Rome, to be the Rock, *contra partem donati. Numerate Episcopos ab ipsa sede beati Petri, ipsa est Petra, quam non vincunt superba inferorum Porta* *.

* Pag. 107.

It is well for them, that this must silence us, they will then for the future be no more troubled with disputing, which is a Work they are very awkward at. But if this will silence us, how comes it to pass that we were not silenced long since, this place having been often produced against us. The truth is, so far is it from stopping our Mouths, that it furnishes us with a new Argument against *Peter's* Supremacy; which when the

Discussor shall consider, he may perhaps be silenced himself; or sneak away as (it is said) those *Wolves* do, that are seen first by Men. Though if I should deny it, the Discussor will not be able to prove, that by the *Rock* is here meant the Succession of the Bishops of *Rome*; yet as I have been all along liberal in my Concessions, so should I for Argument sake grant him this also, it will make nothing to the Advantage of his Cause. For,

1. If it be granted; yet before the Discussor can hence infer the Bishop of *Rome's*, or *Peter's* Supremacy, he must prove, that the Foundation of the Building is ever the supreme Lord of it.

2. If it be granted; yet the Succession of the *Roman* Bishops, cannot by Virtue of these Words, be the sole *Rock*, or any more the *Rock*, than the Succession of Bishops in any other Apostolical Church. This will appear, by restoring to the Text one little Word (*vel*) which the Discussor was so prudent as to leave out. St. *Austin's* Words are these. *Numerate Sacerdotes VEL ab ipsa sede beati Petri, et in ordine illo Petrum, qui cui successit videte. Ipsa est Petra, quam non vincunt superba inferorum porta.* From which Words these things are plain.

(1.) That St. *Austin* here uses the very same Argument against the *Donatists*, that *Irenaus*, *Tertullian*, and several other Fathers had used before, against the Hereticks of their times, to prove the Catholick Doctrine, viz. The Succession of Bishops in the Apostolical Churches †.

(2.) That he proposes the Church of *Rome* only as a single Instance, instead of all those Apostolical Churches, that might have been mentioned; As *Irenaus* before had done, who because it would have been tedious

to

† Iren. l. 3. c. 3.
& l. 4. c. 63.
Tertul. de Præ-
script. c. 32.
Cyprian Ep.
ad Lapfos Edit.
Pamel. 27.

to enumerate the Successions of all Churches, brings for an example, that of *Rome*; which was the greatest and most famous *. And therefore he says not simply. *Numerate Sacerdotes ab ipsa sede beati Petri*, &c. But *numerate Sacerdotes VEL ab ipsa sede*, &c. Which is in effect to say with *Irenaus*, Because it would be too long to reckon the Successions of Bishops in all those Churches, in which the Catholick Doctrine hath been preserved ever since the Apostles; consult at least the Succession of the Church of *Rome*, from the first Founder of it *St. Peter*. And therefore,

3. And consequently, if it be the Succession of the Bishops of *Rome*, that he here makes the Rock, he implicitly affirms the same of any other Apostolical Church, in which there had been a continued Succession of Catholick Bishops; which is further confirmed, in that he elsewhere arguing against the same Donatists, joyns the Church of *Jerusalem* together with that of *Rome*, and makes the Chair of the former, no way inferior in Authority to the latter. *If* (says he to *Petilian*) *all the Bishops through the World, were such as thou most falsely accusest them to be; yet what hath the Chair of the Church of ROME done, in which Peter sat, and in which at this day Anastasius sits; or of the Church of JERUSALEM, in which James sat, and in which at this day John sits, with which we are joyned in Catholick Unity, and from which you by a cursed Fury have separated yourselves†?* And therefore,

me criminari, Cathedra tibi quid fecit Ecclesiæ Romanæ, in qua Petrus sedet, & in qua hodie Anastasius sedet: vel Ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ, in qua Jacobus sedet, & in qua hodie Johannes sedet, quibus nos in Catholica Unitate connectimur, & a quibus vos nefario furore separastis? Contra Lit. Petiliani, l. 2. c. 51.

4. Nothing can hence be inferred for the Supremacy of *Peter*, more than for the Supremacy of *James*, or any other Apostle. If.

* Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ & antiquissimæ, & omnibus cognitæ, &c. Iren. l. 3. c. 3. If. Casaub. Ex. ercit. 15. p. 310.

† Veruntamen si omnes per totum orbem tales essent, quales vanissimi

If any shall ask, why *St. Austin*, in case he did not ascribe some preeminence to the Church of *Rome*, should mention that rather than the Church of *Antioch* or *Jerusalem*? Or why he did not chuse to instance in the Church of *Carthage*, rather than in any other? The Answer is obvious. To the first, because the Church of *Rome* was at that time the most famous, and of greatest esteem of any Church in the World: To the second; because the Donatists objected against the Church of *Carthage*, and other *African* Churches, that the Succession of Bishops had been in them interrupted by Traditors; whereas they could not pretend this against the Church of *Rome*||.

|| If. Casaub.
Exercit. 16. n.
149. P. 540.

S E C T. II.

All that the Discussor contends for in the next Chapter is, *that those Fathers who assert St. Peter's Faith to be the Rock, do not thereby exclude his Person* *. Though it were easy to shew (if their sense be expressed by their Words) that some of them do; yet I may grant him this also. And is it not pity, that so much Labour should be lost, as he hath spent in the Proof of it? That *Theophylact*, *Epiphanius*, *St. Hilary*, *St. Chrysostom*, *St. Cyril*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Basil*, *St. Jerom*, *St. Cyprian*, *Tertullian*, should be all summon'd to bear Witness to that, which is not denied?

Though I cannot foresee any advantage he can take against Protestants from this Concession; yet when he says, *That to affirm the Church to be built on Peter's Faith, is not to bar or disclude his Person, but to signify the CAUSE why it was superedified on him* †: Since I have already proved, that the same Faith was common to them all, it plainly follows, for the same cause, that the

* Pag. 108.

† Pag. 110.

the Church was built upon them all, and not upon *Peter* only. And the meaning of those Fathers, who chose rather to affirm, the Church to be built upon *St. Peter's* Faith or Confession, than upon his Person, was not to assign the REASON, why our Saviour made choice of him above the rest, to build his Church upon (as Dr. Tho. G. tells us) ||: Since those very Fathers (as St. *Petr.*, p. 18. || Sermon of I have shew'd) were of opinion that the other Apostles had the very same Faith, that *St. Peter* made Confession of.

Though all his Quotations are here impertinent, because that is so, for the proof of which they are brought; yet because there may be some such Words or Expressions in some of them, as shew these Fathers were of Opinion, not only that the Church was built upon *Peter's* Person (which is that, for which he alledges them) but (as the Discussor may pretend) infer their Belief of his Supremacy, I shall therefore examine those which make the fairest shew this way; which are one Passage of *Theophylact*, another of *St. Chrysostom's*, and those Titles which some of them give to *St. Peter*, such as *Prince* and *Head* of the *Apostles*, &c.

Theophylact, he says, introduces our Saviour, calling *St. PETER*, the next Rock of the Church after himself*. Though the Word *next*, be not in *Theophylact*, yet suppose it were, it would do him no Service. For might not Christ call him the *next* to himself, for that Priority of Order he had in the Colledg of the Apostles, tho he had no Jurisdiction over the rest? That Stone which lies *next* to the chief Corner-Stone, hath it by virtue of its place, any Dominion over the other Foundation-Stones? Had the Discussor consider'd, how *Theophylact* stood affected toward the Bishop of *Rome's* universal Monarchy, he would have been so wise as not to have

* Pag. 111.

men-

mentioned him, for fear of suggesting to his Reader an Authority against it : For whatsoever opinion he may be supposed to have had of *St. Peter's Supremacy*, it is certain he could have none of the *Pope's* : for as he was contemporary with *Michael Cerularius*, who excommunicated the Pope with the whole Latin Church, for adding the particle *Filioque* to the Creed (as *Barronius* hath proved *;) so it appears by his Comments, that he sided with him in that Controversie.

* Ad an. 1071.
n. 15, 16, 17.
Rc.

But he says *St. Chrysostom* confesses his universal Jurisdiction : How does that appear? Because he says, *God set Jeremy over one Nation ; but Peter over all the World*||. A learned Romanist shall answer this. *Chrysostom*, saith he, (*Hom. 55. on Matth.*) says, that Peter was to be the Foundation, in that sense, that he was to be the Pastor of the Church, and the Preacher of the Gospel: But when the same (*Chrysostom*) says, that Peter was set over the whole World, the meaning is not, that he was set over all Churches simply ; but that he was not to preach the Gospel to one People only, as Jeremy, but to every Nation *.

* Chrysostomus Hom. 55.
in Matth. Petrum futurum

esse dicit eo sensu fundamentum, quod Ecclesie Pastor futurus sit & Evangelii prædicator : Cum vero idem ait Petrum præpositum esse universo terrarum orbi, sensus non est, quod omnibus omnino Ecclesijs, sit præpositus, sed quod non uni Populo, ut Jeremias, sed omni genti Evangelium esset annuntiaturus. Ellies du Pin de antiq. Eccl. Discipl. disert. 4. p. 307.

But methinks the Discussor who quotes *St. Chrysostom* so often, might have remembred what he says of *St. Paul* ; *The care of divers Nations*, says he, was committed to the Angels, but none of them so governed the Nation entrusted to him, as Paul did the *WHOLE WORLD*†. To *MICHAEL* was committed the care of the Jews, but to *PAUL* the Earth, and the Sea, and the inhabited World, and the Desert ||. He had not, says he, the

† Καὶ τοὶ γὰρ ἄγγελοι πολλὰς
κῆρας ἐνεχείρισαν ἐν τῇ διαφύξει,
ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἰς αὐτῶν τὸ ἔθνος,
ὃ ἐνεπαρέσθη οὕτως ἀκατάστατον,
ὡς Παῦλος τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀπα-
σαρ. De laudibus Pauli Apost.
Hom. 2. tom. 5. p. 502. Edit.
Front. Duc.

|| Μιχαὴλ τὸ πρὸς Ἰουδαίων ἔθ-
νος ἐνεχείρισεν, &c. ibid.

the care of one Family, but also of Cities, and of Peoples, and of Nations, and of the whole World *. Can St. Peter's Diocesis be of greater extent? Had *Chrysoftom* thought him *Paul's* Superior, would he not only have affirm'd *Paul* to be of equal Dignity with him, but plainly intimate that he was in honour to be preferr'd before him? as he does in his Comment upon *Galat.* 1. 18.

Had St. *Chrysoftom* taken *Peter* for the Monarch of the universal Church, would he have set St. *James* above him in the Council of the *Apostles* at *Jerusalem*? as every one will see he doth, who will but take the pains to read his 33 Homily on the Acts of the *Apostles*. In short, no Man can imagine, that St. *Chrysoftom* did not think, that every other *Apostle* had a Province as universal, as that of St. *Peter*, who considers, that he makes them *Rulers*, who had not received Nations, and several Cities, but had all of them in common the whole World delivered into their Hands †. This is I think enough, to unveil those imposturous Galleries (to use the Discussor's learned Words) which several misguided Writers (the Discussor for one) obtrude on their easie Readers, under the umbrage of this eminent Author, by depraving his Sense, and contorting his meaning ||.

As for those honourable Titles, which in some of these Quotations are bestowed upon St. *Peter* (as Prince of the *Apostles*, the Head of the Apostolick Quire, &c.) I shall have a more fit occasion of speaking to them in the next Section, to which I shall therefore refer them.

* Οὐτ-Θ οὐκ οἶκας μᾶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόλεων, καὶ δήμων, καὶ ἐθνῶν, καὶ ὁλοκλήρου τῆς οἰκουμένης τῆς περὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν. In a Epist. ad Corinth. c. 11. v. 28.

† Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν χειροτονίας, &c. De utilitat. Lect. Script. Tom. 5. pag. 590. Edit. Front. Duc.

|| Pag. 114.

S E C T. III.

I proceed to the sixth Chapter, where (if any where) we have reason to expect something to the purpose: His Design here is to shew *S. Peter's* Preeminence, as he is the Foundation of the Church above the other Apostles. And yet,

1. He grants, that all the Apostles *in reference to their Apostolick Power, had equal Authority of founding Churches in any part of the World; in Relation to their Doctrine, were equally Orthodox and Infallible: As to what concerned their Writings, they were alike Canonical; and what appertained to the Government of all other Christians, they were equally PASTORS, HEADS, and RECTORS**. This is a large Concession; if in *what appertained to the Government of all other Christians, they were EQUALLY PASTORS, HEADS & RECTORS*; then one would think, *Peter* had not a more *universal Pastorship* than they. But we Hereticks are, it seems, mistaken; For notwithstanding they were all equal Foundations in these Aspects, *St. PETER* was here the only sole Rock, on which *Christ* promised to build his Church: the only and the sole Rock too. But in case he were here the sole Rock, if elsewhere the other Apostles are Rocks too, what Preeminence doth this give him above them? But perhaps he did not intend to lay any Stress upon the word *here*: Well then, they were equally Foundations; but *St. Peter* was the only Rock; that is to say, every one of them was a Rock as much as he; and yet none of them was a Rock but he. Not so; for they were equally Foundations, in respect of all other Christians, whereas *Peter* was the sole Rock of the Church. Were not then all other Christians the Church? not the whole, but only part of it; for

* Pag. 118.

ibid.

for the Church did consist, NOT ONLY OF ALL CHRISTIANS WHATSOEVER, BUT EVEN OF THE APOSTLES THEMSELVES: Then the *Apostles*, it seems, were no *Christians*, since besides all *Christians whatsoever*, the Church consisted of the *Apostles* too; that is, it consisted of such as were *Christians*, and such as were no *Christians*.

It will be said, by all *Christians whatsoever*, he means no more, than all other *Christians whatsoever*, besides the *Apostles*. Be it so; the *Apostles* then were built upon *Peter*, but all other *Christians*, upon *Peter*, and the rest of the *Apostles* jointly. But how could the *Apostles* be built upon *Peter*, seeing they were built (were both Disciples of Christ, and Apostles) before this Promise was made to *Peter*, whereas nothing was built on him, but what was to be built after it.

He adds, *If they (viz. the Apostles) were Foundations, they were sub Petro, et post Petrum*. If they were Foundations *sub Petro*, then *Peter* was built upon them: let it be therefore *post Petrum*, whom our Saviour to preserve Unity, chose out of the Apostolick College, and with his own Hands, laid NEXT TO HIMSELF †. Christ then as the Foundation of all (even of *Peter* too) is laid first, *Peter* is laid next to Christ, the other *Apostles* are laid upon *Peter*, and one upon another in their respective order; let us suppose, in the order, in which they are mentioned by St. Matthew, *Andrew* is laid next to *Peter*, *James* next to *Andrew*, *John* next to *James*: Now in this order, as *Peter* is the Foundation of the other eleven Apostles, so *Andrew* is the Foundation of ten, which are laid upon him, *James* is the Foundation of nine; and so at last, *Peter's* being the sole Rock upon which the Church was built, amounts to no more than this, that one Stone more was laid upon *Peter* than upon

†. Pag. 118

[Pag. 131.]

upon *Andrew*, and two more upon *Peter*, than upon *James*. Again; If the meaning of the Churches being built on *Peter* and his Successors, is, that he and they are supreme Heads of the Church ||. Then the universal Church, all save *Peter*, being built upon *Andrew*, *Andrew* was supreme Head of all, save *Peter* himself: And all except *Peter* and *Andrew* being built upon *James*; *James* was supreme Head of all, except *Peter* and *Andrew*, &c. And so the Church had as many supreme Heads as there were Apostles. And is this at length all that Excellency of Power they ascribe to *St. Peter*?

The Reasons he gives, why Christ made *Peter* the only Rock are, 1. Because he did. HERE engage himself by Promise solely to him, to build his Church on him, upon his peculiar Confession of his Divinity, which the Apostles till they had learnt it of him, were ignorant of. The Foundations of which reason have been already razed. 2. That what our Saviour repli'd to his Confession (to pass over those Elegancies *vicissim* τὸ ἑκάς) was reciprocally directed to him only (the Pronouns *Tu* and *Tibi* excluding Plurality and Partnership) not only as an Approbation, but as a Reward. From the Pronouns *Tu* and *Tibi*, no more can be inferred, than that he in particular was entituled to these Promises; not that the other Apostles were excluded; nor is there one word to exclude them in those sayings of *St. Chrysostom* and *St. Cyril*. he afterward quotes to this Purpose. It is one thing to say, Christ here promised *Peter* only to build his Church upon him; another thing to say, Christ here promised *Peter*, that he would build his Church on him only, and no other. Though the Promise was here directed to *Peter* only, yet nothing is more manifest, than that what is here promised, was afterward conferr'd upon the other Apostles. Instances of a like nature frequently occur in the Holy Scripture. But

But what if this Gentleman presently contradicts himself, and yields, that *Peter* is not the *only Rock*? This he certainly does, if he grants there are other *Rocks* beside him; and he must of necessity grant this, when he says, God *did destine him to be in a more peculiar excelling manner the THE ROCK, on whom he would build his Church**. For could he be *the Rock, in a more excelling manner*, unless there were other *Rocks* whom he excelled? Thus after his bold Advance, he cowardly retreats: The *sole Rock*, is now put the *more excelling Rock*; Christ promised to build his Church not on him *only*, but on him *more eminently*, or on him *in a more signal and remarkable manner*; as he also expresses it †.

* Pag. 124.

† Pag. 119, & 123.

And in this Dr. *Tho. G.* concurs with the Discussor. For having before given St. *Jerom's* Paraphrase upon the Words, he adds, *By which it appears that our Saviour, when he gave to SIMON the Name of PETER, that is, a ROCK, made him the Rock on which he would build his Church, and that in a more eminent manner, than any other of the Apostles* ||. By the way, if he made him the *Rock*, when he gave him the Name of *Peter*, then he made him so before, and by consequence not at the same time when he said to him, *Thou art Peter, &c.* as the Doctor affirms in the Page immediately foregoing; for it is certain he gave him that Name before; *Mark* 3. 16. *John* 1. 42. But let us see what their proofs are, I fear we shall find nothing of the solidity of the *Rock* in them.

|| *Sermon of St. Peter*, p. 23.

1. The Doctor says, That this *is every where affirm'd by the same holy Doctor (St. Jerom) giving him the Titles of PRINCE, CHIEF, HEAD, and GREATEST OF THE APOSTLES*. I grant, that St. *Jerom* gives him these Titles; but absolutely deny, that he meant thereby that Christ built his Church *more eminently* upon him, that is (as he interprets it) gave him a
Pre-

Preeminence of Power over the other *Apostles*. The Reasons of my denial are these; 1. Because in that very place where he says *Peter* was constituted the *Head*, he also says, *What is said of Peter* (Matth. 16. 17, 18.) *is in another Text affirm'd of them all, and*

* At dicis, super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia, licet id ipsam in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, & cuncti claves regni Calorum accipiant, & ex æquo super eos Ecclesie fortitudo solidetur: tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto Schismatis tollatur occasio. Advers. Jovinian. l. 1. c. 27. p. 35. Ed. Basil. 1553.

† Aetati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat, ibid.

|| Petrus Apostolus est, et Johannes Apostolus: maritus, et virgo, sed Petrus Apostolus tantum, Johannes et Apostolus, et Evangelista, et Prophetas, ibid.

* Quid Platoni et Petro? Ut ille enim Princeps Philosophorum, ita hic Apostolorum fuit, super quem Ecclesia Domini stabili mole fundata est. Advers. Pelag. l. 1. c. 2. Tom. 2. p. 265.

† Casaub. Exercit. 15. Diatrib. 12. p. 271, 272. Edit. Franc. 1615. Forbes. Instruct. Historico-Theolog. l. 15. c. 1. Suiceri Thesaur. Ecclesiast. in voce *Interpres*.

Now I appeal to the Doctor, whether *Plato* had Dominion over the rest of the Philosophers. In such a large sense, did St. *Jerom* (and the rest of the Fathers) use the Title *Prince*, so as to denote any sort of Eminency. And the utmost he could mean by it, was no more than this, that *Peter* was the first of the *Apostles*, *Principes* and *Primus* in ancient Authors, being Words of the same Signification, (as many learned Men have shew'd †.) This the Discussor will be forc'd to grant, who once and again

that the strength of the Church is establish'd upon them *EQUALLY* *. And if equally upon all, then not more eminently upon St. *Peter* than the rest. And though he gives the first place to *Peter*, by Reason of his Age †: Yet he tells us, that he was only an *Apostle*, (and by Consequence had no Jurisdiction over the rest) and that St. *John* the youngest, was upon several accounts to be preferred before him: *PETER*, saith he, *was an Apostle, and JOHN was an Apostle; but PETER was an APOSTLE ONLY, John was AN APOSTLE, AND AN EVANGELIST, AND A PROPHET* ||. 2. Because St. *Jerom* so explains his meaning, when he calls him the *Prince of the Apostles*, as to exclude all pretence to Authority over them. For as *Plato*, saith he, *was the Prince of the Philosophers, so Peter was of the Apostles* *.

again renders *πρῶτον τῶν Ἀποστόλων* (the first of the Apostles) by the *Prince of the Apostles* ||. To the same sense are the other Titles, *chief and greatest of the Apostles*, to be understood, and therefore it is needless to say any thing of them distinctly.

|| Pag. 112:
& 114.

2. But St. Paul being to prove, that Christ our Lord transcended all the Quires of Angels in the EXCELLENCT OF HIS NATURE, thought it a convincing Argument to alledge, that he had obtained a more EXCELLENT NAME THAN THEY, forasmuch as our Lord had said to HIM, and to none of THEM, in the second Psalm, THOU ART MY SON, THIS DAY HAVE I BEGOTTEN THEE. And those must think this Argument of St. PAUL to be of no force, who when they hear our Saviour say to SIMON THE SON of Jonas, and to none other of the Apostles, THOU ART PETER, AND UPON THIS ROCK I WILL BUILD MY CHURCH, can think that some SINGULAR PREROGATIVE was not meant by it, to be communicated to him, in which he should EXCEL the rest of his Brethren *. Would then the Doctor prove, that Peter transcends all Orders of Men in the excellency of his Nature, as Christ did all the Quires of Angels? No, but in some singular Prerogative. But if the Apostle concluded from the excellency of Christ's Name, the transcendent excellency of his Nature, I cannot apprehend (such is my dulness) how by virtue of the Apostle's reasoning from the Excellency of Peter's Name, follows a singular Prerogative.

* Sermon of
St. Peter, pag.
23.

But be it so, that a singular Prerogative is hereby meant to Peter, (though it does not follow from the Apostle's Argument) must it be this of *universal Headship*? Why not some other of those twenty eight Prerogatives enumerated by Bellarmine? Particularly, why not the 13th, that he first preach'd to the Jews, after the Descent

† De Rom.
Pontif. l. 1. c.
22.

|| Ibid.

* Ibid.

Descent of the holy Ghost, and by that first Sermon converted 3000? † Or why not the 14th, that he wrought the first Miracle for the Confirmation of the Christian Faith? † Or why not the 17th, that he first preached to the Gentiles? Especially considering, that as preparatory to this, he had that Vision, in which it was said to him, Arise Peter, kill and eat, which seems to some Men a plain Proof of his Headship: For it being the Property of the Head to eat, and by eating to transmit the meat to the Stomach; hereby is signified, that Peter AS HEAD OF THE CHURCH, was to convert Infidels, and make them Members of the Church †.*

† Nam capitis est manducare, & per manducationem trajicere cibum in stomachum, et illum sibi incorporare. Significatur enim hac metaphora Petro convenire, ut ipse tanquam Caput Ecclesie Infideles convertat, et efficiat membra Ecclesie. De Rom. Pontif. l. 1. c. 22.

|| If. Casaub.
Exercit. 15.
Diatrib. 13. p.
291, 292.

the Fathers, it is used in a metaphorical sense ||?

And yet after all, I see no more reason to conclude, that any *singular Prerogative* was hereby meant to be communicated to *Peter*, than to *James* and *John*, when our Lord surnam'd *them*, and *no other of the Apostles BOANERGES*. If it be said (as I know it is) that this was to them a surname only. I answer; so was the name *Peter*, a name only superadded to his former, *Simon*; for he ever retain'd that name, and therefore frequently after this, is called sometimes *Simon Peter**: Sometimes simply, *Simon* †: And *Peter* is expressly said to be his Surname ||. And the reason why we do not find the Sons of *Zebedee* afterwards call'd by that name *Boanerges*, may

* John 13. 6, 9, 24. John 18. 10, 15, 25. John 20. 2, 6. John 21. 2, 3, 7, 11, 15. 1 Pet. 1. 1.

† Matth. 17. 25. Marc. 14. 37. Luke 22. 31. Luke 24. 34.

|| Acts 10. 5, 18, 32. Acts 11. 13.

may be, because it was given in common to them both, so that they could not thereby be distinguished the one from the other, as *Simon* was from all the rest of the Apostles by his name *Peter*.

Again, suppose Christ said *here* to *Simon*, and to none other of the Apostles, *Upon this Rock I will*, &c. Can any singular Prerogative be hence concluded, if at another time he said the same in effect to every one of them? as he certainly did, when he said to every one of them, * *Matth. 28.*
Go teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c. * *Go into all* 19.
the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature †. † *Mark. 16.*
 But I think I need ask no more Questions, to expose 15.
 the weakness of this Argument.

Which because the Discusfor hath improv'd by some additional Strength, I shall therefore consider what he says, before I proceed with the Doctor.

There can be, says he, no other Reason assigned, why Christ of all his Disciples, chang'd only Peter's Name (he did not change it, but only added another name to it) *for a name that did denote a ROCK, but that by this Anonomastical, (I wish this hard word do not fright the Reader) Appropriation of that Word to him, he did destine him to be in a more peculiar excelling manner THE ROCK, on whom he would build his Church* ||. What? can there be no other Reason assigned, when within less than four lines after, he himself says, *I find that there be two especial reasons, why Peter had this new Name; one is for his firm Faith.* He is the most lucky Man at contradicting himself, that ever I met with. And this other Reason he here assigns, is that which is commonly given by the Fathers: For to *St Chrysostom*, whom he alledges for it, I could add (were it needful) a great many more.

|| *St. Peter's Supremacy faithfully discussed, p. 121.*

But the chiefest Reason, says he, (and therefore not the only Reason) why he was called so, was because by that name, Christ discovered his Intention of building his Church on him*. This is not the thing to be prov'd, but that Christ hereby discover'd his Intention, of building his Church more eminently upon him, than on any other of the Apostles. And this he fairly slips over, and of all the Fathers (viz. Cyril, Origen, Jerom, Hilary, Tertullian) whom he here quotes, not one of them hath so much as one Word that gives the least Intimation of it.

But what follows next, is, he tells us, not undeserving of an Asterisk †. I am the more heartily glad on't, because we have met with nothing hitherto, but what has deserved an Obelus. The other Apostles are call'd *οι μὲν οἱ*, which is communicable as well to PETER as to any of the rest; but he besides that Name common to him with the other, had his new Name PETRUS appropriate to himself. But what is it in this Observation, that renders it so considerable? 'Tis this, *οι μὲν οἱ* signifies a Foundation in general, it may be of Wood, Wool-Sacks, Straw, Hay, or any such evanescent matter, and accordingly the Sees of the other Apostles have been detriumph'd, stooping to the insulting Conqueror, and yielding to the Pollutions of undermining Heresy: But PETER signifies such a Foundation as is fix'd on an inexpugnable Rock, &c. || In which passage I observe several things, which (to use the Gentleman's own Word's) are not undeserving of an Asterisk.

1. We have here a Foundation of Straw or Hay. A new sort of Foundation for a House, which he has not borrowed from his Master Bellarmin; let him therefore have the honour of the Invention.

2. That

2. That all the other Apostles were Foundations of Wood, Straw, or Hay; for he gives this as the Reason why their Sees *have been detriumph'd, stooping to the insulting Conqueror.* This methinks does not well agree with St. John's Description of the Christian Church, (whose Writings he yet grants are as Canonical as St. Peter's) for he represents none of the *Apostles* as a Log of Wood, or a Bundle of Hay, but every one as a Stone, as a *precious Stone* in the Foundation of the Wall of the *New Jerusalem.* And if in respect of *all other Christians* (as he grants) the *Apostles* were *equally Foundations*, then St. Peter himself was a *Rock* in respect of the *Apostles* only, but a Foundation of Wood or Straw, with respect to those other Christians that were built upon him.

3. How can this be the Reason why the Sees of the other Apostles *have been detriumph'd*, seeing they were not only founded severally upon their respective *Apostles*, but all of them jointly upon Peter himself? For tho the other Apostles were Foundations with respect to other Christians; yet they were but the Superstructure (as he would have it) with respect to St. Peter who was the Rock upon which the Apostles themselves were built, and by consequence all the Christian Churches that were built upon them.

But it may perhaps be said, Tho Peter was indeed a Rock, yet a Foundation of Straw being laid upon him, this intermediate Foundation failing, the Superstructure must fall too. True. But may we not as wisely argue, Though Christ was indeed a Rock, yet Peter was but a Foundation of Straw, laid upon him the *primary Foundation*, since his See hath been so often *detriumph'd, yielding to the Pollutions of undermining Heresy*; witness Pope Liberius, Honorius, and other Heretical Popes.

And therefore if what he next asserts be true, I see nothing to the contrary, but *Peter* himself may be as *evanid a Foundation* as any of his Fellow-Apostles. For,

5. In the next words *Peter* is again transubstantiated into a *Rock*, and such a *Rock* as is not only able to repel the foaming Surges of the aspiring Sea, but can walk on the back of its towering Waves*. This is really an egregious surpassing Rock. A Rock that can walk! A Rock that can walk upon the back of Waves; A Rock that can walk on the back of towering Waves! And which makes the wonder still greater, a *Rock immovable*! an *immovable Rock*, walking on the back of towering Waves. If *Peter* be such a *Rock*, I grant him to be the sole and only Rock of this kind. And who can question but such a *Rock*, is able to evacuate all the Plots of *Hell's Divan*, and naufragate all the luxid Designs of *impoisoned Hereticks*. Old excellent!

But briefly to shew the vanity of this Criticism.

2dly, It is plainly inconsistent with the use of these words by the Fathers. For as they commonly call Peter *Θεμέλιος*, so they give the name *πέτρα* (*Rock*) to the other Apostles. The Author of the Homily of the twelve Apostles attributed to St. Chrysostom, calls them all the Rock of the Church †. St. Jerom, in the place fore-cited, saith, *Christ is the Rock*, and

be

he gave to his *Apostles*, that they should be called *Rocks* ||. And upon these words, *The Rocks were rent*. *The Rocks*, says he, were the hard Hearts of the *Gentiles*. Or, the *Rocks* were the Predictions of the *Prophets*, who both themselves with the *Apostles* received the name of a *ROCK* from the *ROCK* Christ *. Nor is this name given to the *Apostles* only, but *Chrysostom* calls *St. Stephen*, the rational *Rock* †. Yea this Title is not only by *Origen*, but by other Antients applied to every sound Believer: As by *St. Ambrose* (in the place before-quoted). And *Greg. Nazianzen* gives a reason why they are call'd by this name ||. It is therefore no dismounting of *Peter* from his due Honour, to say the other *Apostles* were *Rocks*. But,

4thly, I ask, what is the meaning of *Θεμελιος*, when *Peter* is so called? Does it signify sometimes a *Rock*-Foundation, sometimes a Foundation of *Wood*, sometimes of *Straw*, or *Hay*? No surely, when *St. Peter* is called by this Name, it ever denotes a *Rock*, an *immovable*, an *inexpugnable Rock*. And why not so, when it is absolutely without any lessening adjunct, without any note of distinction, attributed to the other *Apostles*? When the twelve Sons of *Jacob* are called the twelve Patriarchs (as the twelve *Apostles* are called the twelve Foundations) would not he deserve to be laugh'd at, who shall say, that the name Patriarch, when attributed to *Reuben*, signifies a *Princely Father*, but when ascribed to *Simeon*, denotes a *Subject-Father*? And is not he as ridiculous, who shall say, that by this word *Foundation*, when affirmed of *Peter*, is meant a *Rock*, when of

|| *Petra Christus est qui donavit Apostolis, ut ipsi quoque Petre vocentur*. Comment. in *Amos* 6. v. 12.

* *Ex Petra scissæ sunt, dura corda Gentilium; sive Petre, universa vaticinia Prophetarum qui et ipsi a Petra Christo cum Apostolis Petre vocabulum acceperunt*, &c. *Hieron. Hedibiz Quest.* 8.

† *Τὸ πῶν τὸ πέτρον ἐκείνου τὸ λογικὸν πέτρον αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐκείνου*.

|| *Οὐδὲν εἶναι πέτρα τὸ πέτρον ἐκείνου ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὡς ἐκείνου, &c.* *Orat.* 28.

James

James a Wool-sack, when of Andrew a Hay-mow? I need say no more to expose the folly of this groundless fancy. I shall therefore return to the Doctor.

3. *The Apostles themselves, he says, understood it to be so. This he dares not stand to, and therefore adds, at least after the coming of the Holy Ghost: Why not before the coming of the Holy Ghost, if our Saviour meant it by these Words, Thou art Peter? &c. It seems his meaning was so obscurely expressed, that it could not be understood without the help of a Miracle. But how does it appear, that the Apostles understood it so after the coming of the Holy Ghost? The four Registers left us of their Names, are so many Authentick Testimonies to inform us; the first by St. Matth. c. 10. v. 2. The second by St. Mark, c. 3. v. 16. &c. For although St. ANDREW were before St. PETER in divers respects, &c. Yet PETER by all the foresaid Evangelists, is evermore set before ANDREW, and the rest of the APOSTLES. But if St. Paul's Testimony be as Authentick as that of the Evangelists, then this Argument is as good against Peter's Supremacy, That St. Paul when he names him with other Apostles, never puts him first, but sometimes last; As*
 † 1 Cor. 9. 5. *the Brethren of the Lord and Cephas†. I am of Paul, I*
 † 1 Cor. 1. 12. *of Apollos, I of Cephas* ||. How vain this Argument is, we may learn from a Gentleman of the Roman Communion: *It is (saith he) with very little Reason, that they make an Argument of this, to prove his Royalty in the Church. In SPAIN where the most honourable walk the last, they will not fail to allege those Places where St. PETER is named the last; as in that Passage, where it is said, I AM THE DISCIPLE OF PAUL, AND I OF APOLLOS, AND I OF CEPHAS. For I remember that at PARIS, where they a little better understand Divinity than in SPAIN, a good Bishop and an Abbot that*
did

did maintain, that the Passage where it is said that James Peter and John are reputed Pillars of the Church, prov'd well the Primacy of St. PETER: For said the Bishop, when three worthy Persons walk together, they always put the most honourable in the middle. This is what is commonly said, that an Advocate well paid, always finds the cause of his Client good *.

* Ainsi c'est avec bien peu de raison que l'on fait un argument de cela

pour prouver sa rogaute dans l'Eglise. En Espagne où les plus honorables marchent les derniers, on ne manqueroit pas de alleguer les lieux où S Pierre est nommé le dernier, comme dans le passage ou il est dit. Je suis Disciple de Paul &c. Moyers surs et Honnestes pour la Conversion de tous les Heretiques, p. 16, 17.

But St. Matthew not only puts him in the first place, but expressly gives him the Title of PRIMUS, &c. And there is another remarkable Circumstance in the aforesaid Catalogues, that whereas the other Apostles are never named in order, but differently, not only by different Evangelists, but by one and the same, &c. Yet PETER is every where set in the Head of the Catalogue, and preferr'd before them all; which certainly cannot be imputed to CHANCE, or the WILL of the Writer, but to the particular Direction of the Holy Ghost †. We do not impute this to Chance, or to the Will of the Writer, but suppose there was a special Reason for it; but this Reason we say, was his Primacy of Order, not any Superiority of Power over the rest of the Apostles. He is Primus who hath the first place in any Society, and for that Reason is expressly so call'd, and put in the Head of the Catalogue, as the Doctor very well knows. And this place St. Peter enjoy'd while our Saviour lived on Earth, but after his Ascension to Heaven, James the Brother of our Lord was set above him: For he (as Eusebius and St. Jerom tell us, ||) was chosen by the Apostles, yea by Peter himself as well as the rest (as Clemens of Alexandria tells us*) Bishop of Jerusalem, and preferr'd before them

† Serm. of St. Peter, p. 24, 25, 26.

|| Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 2. c. 1. Hieron. de Script. Eccles. in Jacobo. * Clemens. Hypot. l. 6. apud Euseb. l. 2. c. 1.

them all. And therefore after this we find them rank'd in this order, *James, Peter, and John*; *James* first, as the Brother of our Lord, and Bishop of *Jerusalem*; *Peter* next, as the first of the Apostles under *James*, as he had been before the first under *Christ*; and *John* next, as the beloved Disciple. The like order was observed in the Synod of the Apostles at *Jerusalem*; For as it was the Custom in such Assemblies, for him that was first, to speak last; so we accordingly find, that *James* as President of that Council spake last, summ'd up all that *Peter* had said before him, and gave the final Determination, *Διό ἐγὼ κρίνω, Wherefore I judg, or give Sentence* †. Hence it was, that the Synodical Decree was drawn up in the words of St. *James*; hence also, that when *Peter* was deliver'd out of Prison by an Angel, he commanded the Disciples to shew it unto *JAMES and the Brethren* ||. And that when St. *Paul* came to *Jerusalem*, he went the next day to *James* *. Now though I think it may be convincingly proved, that this *James*, was *James the Son of Alphaeus*, yet I need not insist upon that, because if it was not he, but another of the second rank of the Apostles, (as some contend) the Argument will be yet the stronger against St. *Peter's* Supremacy.

It is an Argument that the Fathers ascribed no such Authority to St. *Peter*, in that what he produces from them for the Proof of it is nothing to the purpose; as will appear by the recital of it. When St. *Paul* says of himself, Gal. 1. 18. *that he went to Jerusalem on purpose to see PETER, St. AMBROSE, (or the Author of the Commentaries, &c.) gives this reason of it; because he was PRIMUS INTER APOSTOLOS, CUI DELEGAVERAT SALVATOR CURAM ECCLESIAE, The FIRST AMONG THE APOSTLES TO WHOM*

OUR

† Acts 15. 19.

|| Acts 12. 17.

* Acts 21.

OUR SAVIOUR HAD COMMITTED THE CARE OF THE CHURCHES†. What's here, that looks toward a Supremacy? Is it, that *Peter* is called the first among the Apostles? The Vanity of this hath been already shew'd. Is it, that the care of the Churches was committed to him? This is no more than what was committed to every one of the Apostles. Nay, so far was this Author from asserting this, that within six lines after the words quoted, he speaks of *St. Paul* as (*Co-apostolus*) fellow-Apostle with *St. Peter* ||. And in his Comment upon the 7th ver. of the next Chapter, he hath these words: *He (viz. Paul) names PETER only, and compares him to himself, because he had received the Primacy to found the Church; but he himself also was in like manner chosen, that he might have the Primacy in founding the Churches of the Gentiles: Yet so, as that Peter also might preach to the Gentiles, if there was cause for it, and Paul to the Jews, for we find that both of them preached to both: But yet full Authority is acknowledged to be given to Peter in preaching to the Jews, and Paul's perfect Authority is found in preaching to the Gentiles**. Is this spoken like one who took *Peter* for the Sovereign of the universal Church? I desire the Reader to consult his Comment upon these Words, *When James, Cephas, and John who seemed to be Pillars, &c.* And, to avoid tediousness, shall recite but one passage upon these Words: *But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the Face, &c.* Who durst, says he, resist *Peter* the first Apostle, to whom the Lord gave the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; BUT ANOTHER SUCH AS HE, who in confidence of his Election, knowing himself NOT UNEQUAL TO HIM, might constantly blame what he

† *Serm. of St. Pet. p. 26, 27.*

|| *Veniens ergo ad eum, hospitio receptus est, et apud eum mansit dies quindecim, quasi unusquisque et Coapostolus.* Comment. in Epist. ad Galat. c. 1. v. 18.

* *Petrum solum nominat, et sibi comparat, quia primum ipse acceperat ad fundandam Ecclesiam: se quoque pari modo electum, ut primum haberet in fundandis gentium Ecclesiis: ita tamen ut Petrus Gentibus predicaret, si causa fuisset &c.*

† Nam quis
eorum auderet
Petro primo
Apostolo, cui
claves regni Cœlorum Dominus dedit, resistere; nisi alius talis, qui fiducia electionis suæ
sciens se non imparem, constanter improbare, quod ille sine consilio fecerat?

had unadvisedly done † I leave it now to the impartial Reader to judge, whether this Author took *Peter* to be *Paul's* Superiour?

As little to the purpose is it, that *St. Chrysostom* reckons *Peter the Prince of the Apostles*, as hath been already shew'd: And less yet, that he calls him their *Mouth*, as might be largely shew'd, were it not intolerably irksome to insist upon such Impertinencies. And whereas *St. Austin* says, that he represented the whole Church proper *primatum Apostolatus*, by reason of the Primacy of the Apostleship: *St. Austin* himself tells us in another place, what Primacy he means; *Peter*, says he, the *FIRST IN ORDER of the Apostles* ||

I shall conclude this with the words of two late Authors of the *Roman* Communion. The first acknowledges, that the Primacy of *St. Peter* was that of Order or Place only; the second that this Primacy gave him no Dominion over the other Apostles. In every Society of Men, saith a learned Sorbonist, some Order ought to be kept, and it is necessary, that among many there be some first: It is not therefore to be questioned, but that in the Colledge of the Apostles, some one was first; but the Evangelists testify, that this one was *Peter*, who when they enumerate the Apostles, not only place *Peter*, the *FIRST IN ORDER*, but affirm that he was first*. And again; The Question, whether *Peter* had the *FIRST PLACE* among the Apostles is Historical, and may be proved by the Testimony of Writers, both of the same, and of following Ages†. They say also, says another Romanist, that he is sometimes nam'd the first, but if it had been always so, this would not prove, that he had Authority over the others,

|| Ipse enim Petrus in Apostolorum ordine primus. De Verbo Domini in Evang. secund. Marchi. Serm.

13.

* *Ellies Du Pin*
Dissert. Hist. 4.
p. 311.

† Dissert. 4^{as}.
2. p. 313.

as the Pope assumes it over Bishops: Among the Presidents a Mortier the first hath no Power over the other; nor amongst the Electors of the Empire; the Elector of Mentz who hath the first place, hath not any Authority over the other Electors, and so in every Society, the Primacy does not carry Dominion with it.

Il disent aussi qu'il est quelquefois nommé le pre-

mier, mais s'il ne l'est pas toujours cela ne leur peut servir de rien. Mais quand il l'auroit toujours été, cela ne prouveroit pas qu'il eût autorité sur les autres, comme le Pape en prend sur les eveques, &c. Moyens sur et Honnestes pour la Conversion, &c. p. 144 & 5.

But though it doth not appear by what the Doctor hath alledged, That the Apostles after the coming down of the Holy Ghost, understood Christ's words in the Roman Sense; yet by many other Passages in the New Testament it is obvious, that neither St. Peter himself, St. Paul, or the other Apostles had any such sense of them. For if St. Paul had, would he have affirm'd, That he was in nothing behind the very chiefest Apostle? would he have rebuked Peter publicly, before them all? If the other Apostles had so understood them, would they have taken upon them to send Peter to Samaria? should not they rather have been sent by him? If St. Peter himself had so understood them, would he have done nothing *Authoritatively*, and as their Prince, but have acted all by the common consent of the Apostles? as St. Chrysostom observes. Having done with the Doctor, I now return to the Discussor. And,

† 2 Cor. 12. 11.

|| Gal. 2. 14.

* Acts 8. 14.

† C'est de au
tousjours comme
mura mura
yulius, idu
audemur, de
si agnus,
&c. in Act.

Apost. Rom. 3.

† St. Pierre's
Supremacy, &c.
p. 123.

• Pag. 123.

4. He next produces the *Sayings of some Fathers*, to prove the Church more eminently built upon Peter than on any of the other Apostles. Such sayings, he imagins, as may be a sufficient Collation to open our ciele'd Eyes, and fetch off those Scales, which have obstructed our wise Faculty*. Tho we make not the Sayings of the Fathers, but the Holy Scripture, the Rule of our Faith; and if in this, or any other point, we should

refuse to stand to their Judgment, the *Romanists* cannot blame us, without condemning themselves, since no Men pay less respect to the Fathers than they, when they find themselves pinch'd with their Authority; yet so far are we from declining their Judgment, in this, or any other matter in dispute, between us and the Church of *Rome*, that we confidently appeal to them.

The first he produces is *St. Jerom*, who on *Isa. 2.* having compared them (*viz.* the Apostles) to Mountains, says, *Super unum montium Christus fundat Ecclesiam, et loquitur ad eum, dicens, Tu es Petrus, et super hanc Petram, &c.* that is, upon one of the Mountains Christ founds his Church, and speaks to him, saying, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* That Christ founded his Church on *Peter*, is not the thing to be proved, but that he more eminently founded it on him, than on any other Apostle. He will say perhaps, this is imply'd; How so? Because in saying, *Christ founded his Church upon one of the Mountains*, he implicitly excludes all the rest. If so, then he excludes all the rest, not from being more eminently, but from being simply Foundations; whereas he himself grants, they were all Foundations, in saying *Peter was more eminently so.* But whosoever shall impartially read the Context, he will conclude it was far from *St. Jerom's* meaning, to exclude the other Apostles from what he here attributes to *St. Peter*, for but six lines before, he says, *This House (viz. the Church) is built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, who also themselves are Mountains; as Imitators of Christ.* But why then does he here say, that Christ founds his Church upon one of them? I answer, the plain reason is this, These Words being directed to *Peter* alone, and none other, *St. Jerom* was of Opinion, that Christ in this place, made him alone the

† Hæc domus
ædificata est su-
per fundamen-
tum Apostolo-
rum & Prophe-
tarum, qui &
ipsi montes
sunt, quasi imi-
tatores Christi.

Foun-

Foundation of the Church, but that *elsewhere* he made all the Apostles Foundations equally with him. This he as expressly and plainly asserts as Words can do it, in the place before-quoted out of his first Book against *Jovinian*; c. 27.

But what follows, *must needs confound all the Enemies of St. Peter and his Successors, but such as have their face cased in triple Brass* ||. A Case very much in fashion || Pag. 123^a with them, whose Head wears the *Triple-Crown*; otherwise they could never so impudently outface the Truth, as they daily do.

But what is this which must of necessity confound us? That *St. Jerom*, besides his owning him to be the Rock, he calls his *Cathedra* at Rome likewise so, in his *Epistle* to *Damasus*; *Ego Beatitudini tue, id est* (says he) *Cathedrae Petri communione confocior, super illam Petram adificatam Ecclesiam scio*. I can perceive nothing in this Testimony so confounding, as to need a *Case of triple Brass* to fence us against it. For,

1. Suppose that by the Rock *Jerom* meant *S. Peter's* Chair at *Rome*, (though *Erasmus* was of opinion, that he meant thereby the Faith *Peter* professed *) yet he meant his Chair as then possessed by *Damasus*, who had hitherto stood firm as a Rock against those Assaults of Heresy which had prevailed over the Eastern Church. But he was far from thinking, that all his Predecessors had done so, or that it was necessary that all his Successors should do so, as is sufficiently intimated in this very *Epistle*: For when

he says, *NOW in the West the Sun of Righteousness arises, but in the East Lucifer which fell hath set his Throne above the Stars* †. That rising *Now* necessarily im-

* Non super Romam ut arbitror, nam fieri potest, ut Roma quoque degeneret, sed super Fidem quam Petrus professus est.

† Nunc in Occidente Sol Justitiae oritur, in Oriente autem Lucifer ille qui ceciderat, supra Sydera posuit Thronum suum.

|| Catalog. Scri-
ptor. Ecclesiast.
in Fortunacia-
nus. tom. 1. p.
297.

plies that he thought this *Sun* had either set, or at least declined some time before: And this he elsewhere plainly expresses when he tells us, that Pope *Liberius* subscribed to Heresy ||: For in case *Liberius* did not (as some Men in contradiction to the clearest evidence would persuade us) yet it is certain that St. *Jerom* thought he did; and therefore as certain, that he did not believe, that the Chair of St. *Peter* was then the Rock, upon which the Church was built; unless he thought the Chair was more infallible than he that sat in it. And as he believed that Heresy had got into the Chair formerly, so he thought it not impossible, but it might do so again; yea, that even *Damasus* himself might fall into the Arian Perfidiousness; else why does he in this same Epistle so earnestly deprecate it? * Had he foreseen the Council of *Trent*, he would doubtless have foretold the time, when this *Sun* would come to suffer a dreadful Eclipse in the Roman Horizon.

* Jungatur cum Beatitudine
Ursicinus, cum Ambrosio socie-
tur Auxentius. Absit hoc a Ro-
mana Fide.

2. That these words (*Super illam Petram edificatam Ecclesiam scio, Upon this Rock I know the Church is built*) are not to be confined to *Peter*, or his See only, *Jerom* himself hath also taught us. For upon these words, *Her Foundations are upon the holy Hills*, he says, Who may we say are the Foundations? the Apostles: In them were the Foundations, there the Faith of the Church was first placed, and there the Foundations were laid †. Does he say St. *Peter* was the *only* Foundation, or *more eminent*ly the Foundation? No, but without making a difference, or preferring him before the rest, *The Apostles were the Foundations*. In his first Book against *Jovin-*

† Fundamenta eius in monti-
bus Sanctis. Quos nos possumus
dicere Fundamenta? Apostolos.
In illis erant fundamenta; ibi
primum posita est fides Ecclesi-
e, & ibi fundamenta sunt posita.
Comment. in Psal. 86.

nian

man, written eighteen years after this Epistle, he expressly asserts, That the Church is *equally* founded upon them all. Once more, St. *Jerom* makes all Bishops, how much soever one may exceed another in Wealth, to be of equal Worth, and of the same Priesthood, because they are all Successors of the Apostles. And could he have argued the equality of Bishops, from their being the Apostles Successors, had he not taken it for granted, that the

Apostles themselves were *equal*? I shall add this only, That in case *Jerom* had been of opinion, that *Peter* had Authority over the other Apostles; yet that he acknowledged no such Authority in the *Pope* over other Bishops, we need go no further than this Epistle to prove, in which he calls the Egyptian Confessors his Colleagues*.

When I reflect upon the Premises, I cannot but a little wonder, that this Saying of St. *Jerom* should leave such a *deep Incision* in this Gentleman's Mind, that he needed to repair to any Doctor, much less, to so great a Doctor as Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, for a *σφοδρὸν φάρμακον* to heal it; yet supposing him so deeply wounded, I do not wonder that he found himself defeated of his desired Satisfaction. For is it likely that Patient should meet with a Cure, who throws by all the principal Ingredients of the Medicine prescribed, and makes Application but of one, and the most inconsiderable of them all? Those Words he quotes, as if they were all the Doctor had said, are such as the Doctor himself lays no Stress upon, for after them, he adds, *But setting aside what advantages might be gain'd on that account, to weaken the force of this Testimony*†. And then goes on for more than two Pages together, in shewing to how little Purpose this Te-

|| Ubique fuit Episcopus &c. ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et Sacerdotii. Potentiā divitiarum & paupertatis humilitas vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum, non facit: ceterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt. Epist. ad Evagrium.

* Ideo hic col. legas tuos Ægyptios Confessores sequor.

† Rat. Account. l. 2. c. 1. p. 311.

stimony

stimony is alledged, which the Discussor has the Face to say he would fain shift off, by making it a Piece of

¶ Quod vero ait, Super illam Petram ædificatam Ecclesiam scio, quicunque extra hanc domum comederit Agnum prophanus est, &c. dictum est officiose, & per exaggerationem. Du Pin. dissertat. 5. c. 2.

Flattery or a Complement to *Damasus*. Behold the Virtue of *triple Brass*! And yet had the Doctor insisted upon it, that it was a Complement to *Damasus*, he had said no more than what one of the learnedest Romanists of this age hath said ¶.

His next Proof is taken out of St. *Cyprian*. *Ecclesia qua una est super unum qui claves ejus accepit, voce Domini fundata* *. 'Tis strange he should think to find any

* Pag. 125.

† Dodw. Disc. concerning the one Altar, &c. c. 9. p. 253.

thing for the Pope's Supremacy in St. *Cyprian*, who (to use the Words of a learned Author †) makes all Bishops equal, to have the same Power in solidum, to be absolute Judges of their own Acts, and to be accountable to none but God; and that there was but one Episcopacy among them all, which notwithstanding was possessed by each of them, not in parcels, but entirely. How inconsistent is this with that Supremacy, which is challenged by the Pope over all the Bishops of the World? However it is certain, that this Passage also, proves either too much, or it proves nothing. If when he says the Church is founded upon one, it be understood exclusive of the other Apostles, it proves too much, viz. that the Church is founded not more eminently upon Peter, but upon him alone. If one

¶ Hocerant utique & ceteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi & honoris & potestatis, de unitat. Eccles.

be not exclusive of the rest, it proves nothing: And that *Cyprian* intended not to exclude the rest, from an equal share with St. Peter, is also manifest, in that he says, *The other Apostles doubtless were that which Peter was, endowed with equal Fellowship of Power and Honour* ¶.

To reconcile St. *Cyprian* to himself, a learned Romanist gives us this account, why in one place, he saith the Church is founded upon one, and in another place upon many: *Cyprian*, saith he, in the first Exposition, (viz.

(viz. that the Church is founded on Peter) seems to exclude the second (that it is founded on all the Apostles) but in Truth he does not exclude it, if his Scope be considered. In the first he writes, that the Church is founded on ONE PETER, that against the emergent Discords of Christians in matters of Religion, he might commend the Unity of the Church. In the second, he says, the Church is constituted on Bishops, that the same Unity of the Church he had commended in ONE PETER, he might commend in the MANY SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES. As if he should say, whether it be one Apostle, or many Apostles upon whom the Church is built, but ONE Church is built, and not MANY. Wherefore in the first Exposition he disputes against those who would rend the Church by Schism; in the second he reproves the lapsed, who also had written to Cyprian himself, of the usurped Peace given them by Paul the Martyr*.

* Cyprianus in Expositione prima secundam videtur excludere, sed re-

vera non excludit, si scopus operis attendatur. In prima super unum Petrum edificatam esse scribit Ecclesiam, ut adversus emergentes Christianorum in Religione discordias, unitatem Ecclesie commendaret. In secunda constitutam esse super Episcopos dicit Ecclesiam, ut quam Ecclesie unitatem in uno Petro commendaverat, eandem in pluribus Apostolorum successoribus commendaret, &c. Launoy Epp. P. 5. Ep. ad Voellum.

But to clear up St. Cyprian's meaning, I shall speak a little more distinctly: His Sense in this matter, may I think be comprised in these Propositions, which I shall now barely mention, and if occasion require it, shall hereafter fully confirm.

1. That our Saviour when he spake these Words, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church*, promised to Peter alone, and no other, that the Church should be founded on him. Hence it is, that he says, *the Church is built upon one.*

2. Whatsoever in these Words he promised to Peter, he afterwards conferr'd the same, and in the same De-

gree upon the other Apostles. Hence it is, that he makes them *all equal in Honour and Power with Peter*.

3. That he promised this at first to *Peter alone*, to recommend that Unity he designed to have in his Church, and to make him the Pattern of it; so far was he from thinking of any Power over the rest here promised to *Peter*, that he never so much as intimates it.

4. That the Unity he made him the Pattern of, was not that of the universal, but of particular Churches; he promised to build his Church upon *one*, to shew that in every particular Church he would have but *one*, that should be the Principle of Unity, the Foundation upon which all the rest should depend.

5. That the Bishops as Successors of *St. Peter*, are this Principle of Unity, and the Foundation, every one in his own Church, upon which all the rest depend. It never entred into his Thoughts, that any one Bishop, was to be the Principle of Unity to all other Bishops and Churches in the World. Nor did *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, in his Contests with *Cyprian*, ever pretend this; which doubtless he would have done, had any such Prerogative been then claim'd by *Stephen*, or granted by *Cyprian*; since this, without any more ado, must have brought *Cyprian* to a Submission to him. And therefore,

6. He supposed these Words, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock*, &c. were as applicable to all Bishops, as they were to *St. Peter* himself; and accordingly they are by him so aply'd, and the Rights of all particular Bishops established upon them; so far was he from finding in them any peculiar Prerogative of the Bishop of *Rome*. And what is there now of *St. Peter's Sovereignty* in all this? or of the Churches being built *more eminently* upon him, than upon the other Apostles? Not so much as one word that looks that way. I

I presume he quotes the next words out of *Cyprian*, *Navigare audent & ad Petri Cathedram, atque ad Ecclesiam principalem, unde Unitas Sacerdotalis exorta est*; for these two reasons: (1.) Because the Church of *Rome* is here called the *principal Church*. (2.) Because Priestly Unity is said to arise from thence. But neither of these are to his purpose. Not the first, it being called the *principal Church*, because it was constituted in the principal City; as *Rigaltius* notes upon the Words, and quotes the 28th Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon* to confirm it †. Not the second, because by *Priestly Unity*, he means no more than the Presidency of *one Bishop* in *one City*, which he says is derived from the Church of *Rome*, because that was the See of *Peter*, who was the Pattern of this Unity. And by this he aggravates the crime of *Felicissimus* and his Complices, who having set up another Bishop at *Carthage* in opposition to *Cyprian*, durst make their Appeal to *Rome*, which was the example of Episcopal Unity to other Churches ||. I may here again be allowed to admire this Gentleman's Discretion or Sincerity in the choice of his Testimonies.

† In urbe principali constitutam. Can. 28. Concil. Chalced. &c.

|| See Mr. Dodw. dissertat. Cypr. dissert. 7. p. 161

Nothing can be imagined more directly contrary to that *Papal Supremacy* he contends for, than this very Epistle of *St. Cyprian*, out of which this Passage is taken; in which the good Father most severely condemns Appeals to *Rome*; asserts that every one's Cause ought to be heard where the Fault is committed, that to every Pastor a portion of the Flock is assign'd, which he rules and governs, as one that is to give an Account to God alone, &c. But it may be presumed the learned Gentleman knows nothing of this, nor ever saw any more of the Epistle than these two lines, which he found quoted by some other Author, as wise as himself. Had he perused the whole Epistle, he would not have dared to

quote one word out of it, lest the Reader by examining that, should take occasion to read all the rest.

His next Testimony from *Greg. Nazienzen* says, *That of all the Disciples of Christ, Peter is called the Rock, and intrusted with the Foundations of the Church* *. Which hath been already more than sufficiently answer'd. Had he look'd back no further than the Oration immediately foregoing †, he might have seen, That this Father assigns to every Apostle his particular Province, independently on *St. Peter*; and by consequence did not suppose that the Church was built *more eminently* upon him than the rest.

His last Quotation is out of *S. Basil's 6th book against Eunomius* ||; Why did he not quote the 16th Book? he might have done so, as well as the 6th; there being no more than five Books against *Eunomius*, in *St. Basil's Works*: but this is more than he knew, and therefore he is to be pardon'd. However the place he refers to is, I suppose, in his 2d book, where speaking of *Peter* he hath these words, *τὸ διὰ πλεονεξίας ἐπέροχεν ἐπ' ἐαυτὸν τὴν οἰκοδομὴν ἐκκλησίας διέλαμενον*; that is, *who for the excellency of his Faith, took upon himself the building of the Church*; which is no more than what may be truly affirmed of *St. James*, *St. John*, or any other Apostle. If the Reader please to compare the words cited by the Discussor, with those in *St. Basil*, he will further see that he is not wont to consult the Authors he quotes.

And now at last, that I may, if possible, oblige the Discussor, I will grant, what he has not prov'd; that in some respect it may be truly said, *the Church is built more eminently on St. Peter*. As 1. Because by his preaching especially, the first Christian Church was gathered among the *Jews*. *Peter* standing up with the eleven, lift up his Voice, and said, *Ye Men of Judea, &c.* *

Peter

* Pag. 123.

† Orat. 25.

|| Pag. 115.

* Acts 2. 14.

Peter with the eleven: what means it, says St. Chrysostom? They uttered one common Voice, and he was the Mouth of them all; the eleven stood by, bearing witness to those things that were spoken by him †. And by this Sermon three thousand were converted, which together with the Disciples before-mentioned, made up the first Christian Church.

† Κοινῶ περιέβαλλον φωνῇ, καὶ πάντοι αὐτοὶ ὡς τὸ σῶμα, παραστήσαντες ὃ οὐκ ἔδειξε μαρτυροῦντες τοῖς λεγομένοις.
Chrysost. in loc.

2. Because he first preached the Gospel to the Gentiles, as we find in the story of *Cornelius*, Acts 10. He is called the Rock, because he first laid the Foundations of Faith among the Gentiles ||, says an antient Author, in a Homily father'd on St. Ambrose.

|| Petra enim dicitur, eo quod primus in nationibus fidei fundamenta posuerit.

In the remainder of this Chapter, which is spent in answering several Objections made by his Adversary, I find nothing but what either needs no answer, or what hath been already answered; Though I confess there are many things that deserve an *Asterisk*; particularly the first part of his Answer to this Question; *What Inconvenience would arise from expounding this Rock to be Christ?* To this, saith he, I answer, Though I grant Christ to be called a Rock, yet it is very irrational to interpret the word ROCK of Christ, wheresoever you find it express'd in Scripture; our Saviour being not really a Rock, but only call'd so by a metaphorical locution *: This, he says, is observed by St. Austin. A notable Observation!

* Pag. 129.

C H A P. III.

I Think I have said enough to satisfy every impartial considering Reader, that St. *Peter's Supremacy* is not founded upon *this Rock*, and therefore must fall to the Ground, unless some other Foundation be found to support it. I proceed therefore to the other Promise here made, (*And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, &c.*) upon which they also tell us this vast Fabrick is solidly superstructed.

Now the whole of their Discourse from hence, that is pertinent to the present Question, may be reduc'd to these four Propositions

- I. That this Promise of the *Keys* was made to *Peter* alone.
- II. That he alone *immediately* receiv'd them, and the other Apostles *derivatively* from him.
- III. That the Power of the *Keys* communicated to the other Apostles, was inferior and subordinate to a higher Degree of it in St. *Peter*.
- IV. That by the *Keys* thus promised to and received by St. *Peter*, is meant the supreme Power of governing the Church.

Proposition I.

† *Serm of St. Peter, p. 28.* This Promise, saith Dr. G. *our Saviour made to St. Peter, and to him alone* †. And you see, saith the Discussor,

cussor, *Christ addresses his Reply to Peter only, the Words Tu and Tibi shutting out all Partnership* ||. To which it will be sufficient to return these two things.

|| St. Peter's
Supremacy, p.
18.

1. Suppose the Reply addressed to *Peter only*, and the Promise *here* made to *him alone*; doth it hence follow, that Christ intended to give the thing promised to none else? Had Christ said to *Peter*, to *thee only* will I give the Keys, this would have followed; but it no way follows, from Christ's saying only to him, I will give thee the Keys. From the Promise made to him in particular it only follows, that he in particular should have them; not that none others should have them besides him.

2. Nothing can be more plain, than that at another time Christ made the same Promise to all the Apostles indefinitely. *Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven* ||. But says the Doctor, *however we read, that the Power of binding and loosing, which is an Effect of the Keys, was promised to all the Apostles in common; Matth. 18. 18. yet it was not till after the Keys had been promised to Peter, Matth. 16. 19**. What then? does *before* or *after* make any Difference in the Promise it self? If the King promise to day a Commission to one Man in particular, and promise to morrow the same Commission to him, and ten more together with him, hath that one any Power given him over the other ten, by having his Commission first promised him? But *it is not any where read in Scripture, that the KEYS THEMSELVES the proper TOKEN and BADGE of the supreme Stewardship over the Church, were promised to the rest, but to PETER alone*. But doth not the Power suppose the Badge? Or if it doth not, is there any need of it? Since it is not the Badge,

|| Matth. 18. 18.

* Pag. 29.

† See Dr. Hammond's Answer to Schism div. wrdd, Sect. 7.
n. 12, 13, 14.

Badge, but the Office alone, that we are concern'd for †. If it be granted, that all the rest have equal Power with Peter, let Peter by my consent, have the sole Honour of carrying the Keys. And yet doth he not say just before, *That the Power of binding and loosing, which is an effect of the Keys, is promised to all the Apostles?* And if so, then surely the *Keys themselves*, since the effect ever presupposes the Cause.

But the truth is, as *loosing and binding* are the effect of the *Keys*, so the *Power of loosing and binding* are the *Keys themselves*. *The Church which is founded in Christ*, saith St. Austin, *received from him the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven in Peter, that is, the Power of binding*

|| Ecclesia ergo quæ fundatur in Christo, claves ab eo regni Cælorum accepit, id est, potestatem ligandi solvendi que peccata. In Evang. Johannis, Tractat. 124.

* Clavis dicitur potestas ligandi & solvendi. Aquin. suppl. Qu. 17. Art. 2.

† Sic describitur clavis spiritualis, est potestas judicandi, id est, solvendi & ligandi, &c. Biel in quantum Sentent. Dist. 18. Qu. 1.

and loosing Sins ||. This is the very definition your Schoolmen give of them. *The Power of binding and loosing*, says Aquinas, is call'd the *Key* *. *The spiritual Key*, says Biel, is thus described, *It is the Power of judging, that is, of loosing and binding, by which an Ecclesiastical Judge ought to receive those that are worthy, and exclude those that are unworthy from the Kingdom of God* †. And therefore to suppose that Christ promises the power of binding and loosing,

and not the Keys, is to suppose a contradiction.

This therefore is not to argue like Dr. G. though it very well becomes the Discusor, who also talks at the same rate. *It cannot*, says he, *be prov'd out of the Scripture, that the Keys in EXPRESS WORDS were given to any, but to him (viz. Peter ||) in express words*; It may then, it seems, be proved by *Consequence*; and is not that as well? But unless (as he goes on) you can shew me some place in the New Testament where our Saviour saith to his Disciples JOINTLY, I WILL GIVE YOU THE KEYS

|| Peter's Supremacy, p. 160.

KEYS *, or to any of them in particular, **I WILL GIVE** * *The Disjunctive word est, conjunctionem, Vobis dabo claves.*
THEE THE KEYS †; he hath the best Plea and Title to them. The best Plea, this is poor and sneaking, a plain giving up the cause; for should he have the best Plea, that doth not hinder, but they may have a good Plea, since his Title is no way inconsistent with theirs, it being such a Priviledg as might be equally enjoy'd by them all. And yet I cannot conceive how his Title can be better than theirs, though it be no where said to them jointly, *I will give you the Keys*, if that be said to them jointly, which necessarily imports the same thing, as it is. † *His words est, particula-tim, tibi dabo claves.*

To these Texts, *Mat. 18. 18. Joh. 20. 21.* quoted by his Adversary, to prove the other Apostles had the Keys, he gives this Answer; *That it cannot clearly be inferred from either of these Places, they had them, the word KEYS being not so much as mentioned there* ||. *Not clearly inferred*; it's granted then, that it may be truly inferred, tho not clearly. And why not clearly? because *the word KEYS is not mentioned there*: Very wisely. If what the word *Keys* imports, be clearly mentioned in those places, may it not be as clearly infer'd, as if the word *Keys* were it self mention'd? and that it is so, as it is manifest by what hath been already said, so it is the common Opinion of the Fathers *, and of many learn'd Men of the Church of Rome †, and is no more than is taught by the *Roman Catechism*, in citing *Mat. 18. 18. & Joh. 20. 23.* together with *Mat. 16. 19.* to prove that the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed to the Church ||; all which for brevities sake I remit the Reader to in the Margin, and shall transcribe no more

|| Ibid.

* Tertul. de pudicitia. c. 21. Cypr. Epist. 23. ad Jubaian. et de Unitat. Eccles. Hilary. l. 6. de Trin. col. 74. Hieron. l. 1. advers. Jovinian. August. Sermon. 108. de divers. Bed. Hom. de Sanct. Petro.

† Barlaam. de Primat. Papæ. l. 2. Pet. de Alliaco Qu. in suis Vesp. n. 20. Ejusd. lib. de Eccles. et Cardinal. Authoritate parte 1. c. 1. Traſtat. Cancell. Parisiens. de Potestat. Eccl. et Orig. Juris Confid. 5. Richer. de Ecclesiast. et Polit. Potest. n. 2. et 6.

|| Catechif. Rom. parte 1. de decimo Symb. Artic. S. 4.

than the words of the Sorbon Doctor before quoted: *This Power, saith he, of the Keys which Christ promises here to Peter, he afterwards in the very same words promises to all the Apostles, Mat. 18. 18. and after that gives it to them all, Mat. 28. & John 20. They are very much mistaken who think the Keys were given to Peter alone; but*

* Hanc enim potestatem clavium quam Christus hic Petro promittit, iidem deinde verbis omnibus omnino Apostolis promittit, Mat. 18. & deinceps cunctis largitur, Mat. 28. & Johan. 20. Illi igitur oppido falluntur, qui soli Petro datas claves esse auctumant. At non ita Antiqui, qui unanimo consensu tradunt claves istas in persona Petri totæ Ecclesiæ datas. Du Pin dissentit. 4. c. 1. p. 307, 308v

But he says, If it be granted that the Apostles had the Keys by virtue of these places of Scripture, yet it doth not follow they had them in the same sense and amplitude that Peter had †: Doth it follow, that they had them not in the same sense and amplitude? But this is not now the Question, but whether they had them; and that they had them by virtue of these Texts, every Roman Priest will be forced to grant, or to break that solemn Oath he hath taken to interpret Scripture according to the unanimous Consent of the Fathers ||.

To his Question, *If either or both these Places, were equivalent to dabo tibi Claves, what reason will you give why Peter should have both a particular and general Promise of them?* * If by a particular Promise, he means a Promise to St. Peter in particular; and by a general Promise, the same Promise made to him, and all the Apostles together with him, S. Cyprian shall

† Nam Petro primum Dominus super quem edificavit Ecclesiam, & unde unicatis originem instruit & ostendit, potestatem istam dedit, ut id solveretur in Cælis, &c. Epist. 73, ad Iubaian.

return the Answer. He first gave the Keys to Peter alone, to manifest that Unity he would have in his Church; and to make him the Original and Pattern of it †. Or

if

† Pag. 160, 161.

|| Bulla Pii 4ti super forma Juramenti.

if St. Cyprian's Authority be thought too little, let him take it from Pope Leo I. *That is not in vain commended to one, that is intimated to all; to Peter therefore singly this is committed, because Peter's Pattern is proposed to all the Governours of the Church* || Our Saviour therefore having served this design, in making the Promise first to Peter singly, he afterward makes the same Promise to them all. If he shall ask why he promised them to Peter again, when he promised them to all? It is as wise a Question, as if he should ask, why a Universal includes each Particular contained under it.

But that which follows next is most admirable; *that whatsoever was meant by either of those Texts, they being spoken conjointly to the twelve, Peter had certainly as large a share in them as any* (he need not fear, but he is so far in the right) *but having (over and above his Portion in this joint Promise) a particular one apart to himself, in which the rest were immediately no Shakers, it cannot be disproved, (but by virtue of this singular separate Promise made to him personally in the Presence of the rest) that he had the Keys either alone, or if the Power of the Keys was afterwards given to the rest, that he was supreme in it.* If by this particular, this singular Promise, this Promise made to him personally, he mean a Promise of any particular or singular Power, besides that which was promised to the rest, he supposes that which he should first have proved, and which I have already confuted: If he means that Promise made to Peter particularly and singly, which was afterwards made to all the Apostles, at what an absurd rate does he talk? A Promise is made to twelve jointly; the very same Promise, neither more nor less, was before made to one of these

|| Transivit quidem in Apostolos alios vis istius potestatis, sed non frustra uni commendatur, quod omnibus intimitur. Petro ergo singulariter hoc creditur, quia cunctis Ecclesie Rectoribus Petri forma proponitur.

twelve apart ; therefore this one, hath either himself alone, that which is promised to all the twelve ; or if the rest have it, he hath it in a higher Degree than they : Or thus ; If a Promise be first made to one Man singly, and the same Promise be afterwards made to this one and many more together ; the making the Promise to him first singly, either excludes all the rest from any share in it, or gives him a greater share in it than they. For instance ; the King promises to A in particular, to give him a Captains place, he afterwards promises the same Preferment to A, B, C, D, E, F, together ; A, because the Promise was first made to him alone, must either alone be made Captain, and B, C, D, E, F, excluded ; or if B, C, D, E, F, be made Captains, A, because it was *first* promised to him, must be made their Colonel or General. These are good Consequences by the Discussor's Logick ; and therefore he spake more Truth than perhaps he was aware of, when he said, that *Disputation was an Employment, not only discordant to his Temper, but surmounting his Abilities.* I have said enough to ruin the first Proposition.

Proposition II.

The second is this, that Peter received the Keys immediately from Christ, but the other Apostles from or by him ; Peter says he, *did not receive them, so as to retain them solely to himself, but to communicate them to the other Apostles* *. And again ; *they then may be said to receive the Keys secondarily, derivatively, participatively, by their associating, adhering, and communicating with him their Head* †. The Falseness of which is so manifest, that one would think none but a Man who had never read the New Testament, could have the Face to offer it

* Pag. 162. *tain them solely to himself, but to communicate them to the other Apostles* *.

† Ibid.

to those that have; for can any thing be more evident than that these words, *Whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven, &c.* were spoken by Christ himself immediately, to all the Apostles? And when that Power was actually conferr'd, that was here promised, was it *Peter* or Christ that said to them, *As my Father hath sent me, so send I you, &c. Whose Sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose Sins ye retain, they are retained?* Was it not Christ that said to them immediately, *Go into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature?* But instead of multiplying Proofs from Scripture, I shall rather send him to his Master *Bellarmino*, whom in this Point he deserts. That the Apostles received their Jurisdiction immediately from Christ, and not from St. *Peter*, he proves by four Arguments: "1st. By those Words of Christ, *As my Father hath sent me, so send I you.* Which place, says he, the Fathers, *Chrysostom* and *Theophylact*, so expound, that they plainly say, that the Apostles were made by these words, the Vicars of Christ; yea, that they received the very Office and Authority of Christ. 2^{dly}. By the choice of *Matthias* into the place of the Traitor *Judas*: For we read, *Acts* 1. that *Matthias* was not chosen an Apostle by the Apostles, but his Election being begg'd and obtain'd from God, he was numbred among the Apostles. But surely if all the Apostles had their Jurisdiction from *Peter*, that ought most especially to have been shewn in *Matthias*. 3^{dly}. It is proved from St. *Paul*, who professedly teaches, that he had his Authority and Jurisdiction from Christ, and thence proves himself to be a true Apostle, *Gal.* 1. And that he might shew that he received not his Authority from *Peter* or the other Apostles, he saith, *When it pleased him who separated me from my Mother's Womb, and call'd me by his Grace to*

" reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among
 " the Gentiles; immediately I conferr'd not with Flesh and
 " Blood, &c. 4thly. By evident Reason. For the Apo-
 " stles were made by Christ only, as appears Luke 6. He
 " call'd his Disciples, and chose out of them twelve, whom
 " he named Apostles, &c. But that the Apostles had Ju-
 " risdiction, is manifest by the Acts of St. Paul, who
 " 1 Cor. 5. excommunicates; and 1 Cor. 6, 7, 11, 13. and
 " frequently elsewhere makes Laws; and also because
 " the Apostolical Dignity, is the first and supreme Digni-
 " ty in the Church, as is manifest, 1 Cor. 12. Ephes. 4.
 " &c. I think Bellarmine hath said more than enough for
 the Confutation of the second Proposition. I there-
 fore proceed.

|| De Rom. Pon-
 tif. l. 4. c. 23.

Proposition III.

That the Power of the Keys communicated to the
 other Apostles was inferior, and subordinate to a higher
 degree of it in St. Peter; so says the Discussor — I shall
 here only maintain the inequality, inferiority and subordi-
 nation of this Power in the other Apostles, to an higher,
 sublimar and compleater degree of it in Peter *. But that
 there was no such inferiority or subordination in the
 other Apostles, as he vainly fancies, will soon appear,
 by consulting that place, where the power of the Keys
 before promised, was actually given to St. Peter: The
 words by which it was conveyed are these, As my Father
 sent me, so send I you; and he breathed on them, and said,
 Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever Sins ye remit,
 they are remitted; and whose soever Sins ye retain, they
 are retained †. In which words we have these two
 things.

* Pag. 162.

† John 20. 21,
 22, 23.

First,

First, That the power of the Keys is here given to the Apostle.

Secondly, That this Power is here given equally to Peter, and the other *Apostles*; that is, in as high a degree to the other Apostles, as it was promised to Peter, *Matth.* 16. 19.

First, That the power of the Keys is here given, all those who own the Doctrine & Authority of the Church of Rome (and by consequence the Discussor himself) will be forced to grant: (1.) Because this is expressly taught by the Fathers. (2.) Because it is also taught by the *Roman* Catechism, and the Council of *Trent*.

1. This is no new Conceit of Hereticks, but it is expressly taught by the Fathers, whose unanimous Judgment in the interpreting of Scripture, every Priest of the Church of Rome (as I said before) is by solemn Oath obliged to follow. *If that which is said*, says Origen, *I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, be common, why not all the rest*; BUT IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN OUR SAVIOUR GIVING THE HOLY GHOST BY BREATHING, SAYS, RECEIVE YE THE HOLY GHOST ||. *The Lord*, || Tractat. 1. in Matth.

says Cyprian, *speaks to Peter, I say unto thee---And altho to all the Apostles after his Resurrection he gives equal Power, and says, AS MY FATHER SENT ME, SO SEND I YOU* *.

All the Apostles, says Gaudentius, upon Christ's Resurrection, receive the Keys in Peter; nay rather they receive with Peter from our Lord himself, the Keys of the Heavenly Kingdom; when he saith to them, [Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose Sins ye remit, &c.] †. That ye may

* De Unitat. Eccles.

† Postea vero pro commissio scelere jam damnato Iuda, omnes Apostoli Christo surgente in Petro claves accipiunt. Quinimo cum Petro celestis regni claves ab ipso Domino accipiunt, quando ait illis, Accipite Spiritum sanctum, &c. Tract. quem prima die ordinat. quorund. Civ. Notarii accep.

know

|| Sermon. 108.
de Diversi.

know, says *Austin*, that the Church received the KEYS of the Kingdom of Heaven; hear in another place, what the Lord says to all his Apostles, RECEIVE TE THE HOLY GHOST: TO WHOMSOEVER TE REMIT SINS, THEY ARE REMITTED; AND WHOSOEVER'S SINS TE RETAIN, THEY ARE RETAINED ||. And *Theophylact* in his Comment on *Matth. 16. 19.* Tho it was said to Peter only, I will give thee the Keys; yet it was afterwards given to all the Apostles, when Christ said to them, WHOSE SINS YE REMIT, THEY ARE REMITTED, &c. Instead of producing more of the Fathers, I challenge the Discussor to produce one ancient Author who hath said the contrary.

2. But if the Fathers should now lose their Authority (as they are wont to do with the Romanists, whensoever they contradict their new Faith) yet unless he put on his triple case, he will not be able to resist that which follows; passing over many private Authors (as they commonly call them, though licensed by the highest publick Authority) I shall produce only the *Roman Catechism*, composed by the order of the Council of *Trent*, and the Council of *Trent* it self. The *Roman Catechism* speaking of the Minister of the Sacrament of Penance, says, He must have not only the Power of Order, but of Jurisdiction; who ought to perform this Office. But those words of our Lord in *St. John*, afford us an illustrious Testimony of this Ministry, WHOSE SINS TE REMIT, THEY ARE REMITTED TO THEM; AND WHOSE SINS TE RETAIN, THEY ARE RETAINED*. And the Council of *Trent* declares, that all those Opinions are false, and Strangers from the Truth of the Gospel, which perniciously extend to other Men besides Bishops and Priests, the Ministry of the KEYS; thinking those words of our Lord, WHATSOEVER TE BIND ON EARTH-

* De Pœnit. Sacramento, c. 5.
S. 55.

And

*And WHOSESOEVER SINS YE REMIT, THEY ARE REMITTED TO THEM, AND WHOSESOE-
VER SINSTE RETAIN, THEY ARE RETAINED,*
so be spoken indifferently to all the faithful, &c.† By which
it is plain, that the Trent Fathers, took *remitting* and
retaining in St. John, to signify the same thing with *loo-
sing* and *binding* in St. Matthew.

† Scis. 14. de
Sacram. Pœnit.
c. 6.

Secondly, This Power is here given equally to St. Pe-
ter and the other Apostles; or in as high a degree to the
other *Apostles* as it is to *Peter*. This will be cleared
from,

First, The Words themselves.

Secondly, The Judgment of the Fathers upon them.

Thirdly, The Concessions of many Learned Men of
the Church of Rome.

First, From the Words themselves, no part of which
is addressed to *Peter* alone, or to *Peter* more especially
than to any of the rest, but to all of them jointly, with-
out any note of Difference between them. Had our
Saviour been of the Discussor's Mind, he would have
spoken to this Effect, *As my Father hath sent me, so
send I thee Peter; and as I send thee, so do thou send them.*
*Whosoever sins thou remittest, they are remitted; and
whosoever sins they remit, in Subordination to thee as their
Prince, they are remitted.* Whereas we see no such Di-
stinction made, but *as my Father sent me, so send I you,*
without any Preference of *Peter* before the meanest of
them. And accordingly (as an excellent Divine of our
own Church observes) *when the Holy Ghost descended,*
*it was imparted to each of them alike, without any mark of
Distinction. For we read not of one Flame that crowned*

L

the

the Head of St. Peter, greater and more illustrious than that of his Brethren; but the Text saith, the Tongues, like as of Fire, were divided, and sat upon every one of them singly, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, Acts 2. 2, 3. The mighty Wind also wherein this Flame came, filled all the House where they were sitting, and not only that corner where St. Peter was placed. And so this Promise was equally perform'd in common to them all, as it had been made to them all||.

¶ Texts examined
which Papists
cite for St. Pe-
ter's Supremacy,
Part I. p. 95.

Secondly, If we consult the Fathers, we may observe in them those two things pertinent to our Purpose.

1. Not one of them intimates, that any thing was to be found in this Text peculiar to Peter, by which he was set above his Brethren; but whatsoever Power was here given, they supposed it given in common and equally to them all. And some of them expressly tell us, that he gave the same Power here to all the Apostles, that he had before given to one: so do St. Cyprian and Theophylact. 2. The Power here given to all the Apostles, they take to be so full, that a fuller and more ample could not be given to Peter. St. Chrysostom says, He gave them all Heavenly Power, when he said to them, Whose Sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c. And what Power can

be greater than this? The Father hath given all Judgment to the Son, but I see this all Judgment committed to these by the Son*. And Cyril of Alexandria (as I find him quoted by Bellarmine) says, That by these Words, the Apostles were properly created Apostles and Teachers of the whole World; and that we may understand that all Ecclesi-

astical Power is contained in the Apostolical Authority, therefore Christ added, AS MY FATHER SENT ME, &c.

For

* Καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἴκοντο αὐ-
τοῖς τὸν βουγιον ἰδοὺς ἑκάστῳ
ἀνδρὶ φῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦ ἀμαγνίου
ἀφωρταῖ—Τὸ αὖ γέγονε τοῖς
τοῖς ἑκαστῶ μὲλ' αὐτοῦ, πῶς τὸν
ἡλόν, ἰδοὺς ὁ μέγας τὸν ἴον
ἔσθ' ὅτι τὸν αὐτὸν τὸν τοῦ οὐ-
ρανίου αὐτοῦ τὸν τὸν οὐ-
ρανίου. l. 3. c. 5.

For as much as the Father sent the Son invested with the highest Power †. Now can there be any Power or Degree of Power, that is not contained in all, and in the highest Power? I shall add no more, but that Pope Gregory I. by virtue of these Words, ascribes to all the Apostles, *superni judicii Principatum*, and makes them all to be God's Vicars, in retaining some Men's Sins, and relaxing others ||. Yea,

† Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 23.

|| — Principatumq; superni judicii fortiumur, ut vice Dei quibusdam peccata retineant, quibusdam relaxent. Rom. 26. de divers. Lect. Evang.

Thirdly, This is no more than what is acknowledged by many zealous Assertors of the Pope's Supremacy; Of which I shall now name but three, because they may serve instead of a thousand Witnesses, two of the three being Jesuits, and two of them also Cardinals. The Jesuit Maldonate in his Comment upon these Words, tells us, That the Power which Christ had received, as sent by his Father, he gave to his Apostles, whom he sent in his stead, whom he made his Vicars. This is manifest, saith he, from the Words following; for therefore he breathed on them, therefore he said, *Whose Sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c. that he might shew, that he gave as great Authority to them, as he had received from his Father; for there can be no greater, than that of remitting Sins* *. The Cardinal of Cusa says, *We know that Peter received no more Power from Christ, than the other Apostles; for nothing was spoken to Peter, which was not also spoken to the others; as it was said to Peter, Whatsoever thou shalt bind. And therefore we rightly say, that all the Apostles were equal in Power* †. Yea Cardinal Bellarmine himself, having cited the

* Quam potestatem ipse a Patre missus accepisset, eam Apostolis dare quos suo loco mitteret, quos vicarios suos faceret. Hoc apparet ex verbis sequentibus; propterea enim insufflavimus in eos, propterea dixit, *Quos remiseritis peccata* — ut ostenderet se quantam auctoritatem ipse a Patre accepisset, tantam illis dare, &c.

† Scimus quod Petrus nihil plus potestatis Christo a recepit aliis Apostolis. Nihil enim datum est ad Petrum, quod etiam aliis datum non sit. Nonne sicut Petro datum est quodcumque super terram, ita aliis, quodcumque ligaveritis, &c. De Concord. Cath. 2. 13.

Words of St. *Cyprian*, makes this Inference from them. *Where you see, that the same is given to the Apostles by these Words, I SEND YOU, which was promised to Peter by that saying, I WILL GIVE THEE THE KEYS, and afterward exhibited by that, FEED MY SHEEP. But it is manifest, that by these Words, I WILL GIVE*

¶ Ubi vides idem dari Apostolis per illa verba, Ego mitto vos, quod Petro fuerat promissum, per illud, Tibi dabo clavus, et postea exhibitum per illud, pascite oves, &c. Lib. 4. De Rom. Pontif. c. 23.

THEE THE KEYS, and by these, FEED MY SHEEP, the fullest Jurisdiction is to be understood ¶. What can be more plainly expressed, than that the Power convey'd to the *Apostles* by these Words, *I send you*, was equal to that promised to *Peter*, in the Promise of the Keys?

I know *Bellaamine* tells us, that he hath elsewhere shew'd, that this is no Impediment to *Peter's Primacy*; what, not to his Primacy of Power? Can they all be equal in Power, and yet *Peter* be their *Superiour*? But how doth *Bellarmino* reconcile this Contradiction? *We confess*, says he, *the Apostles were equal in Apostolical Power, and had in all things the same Authority over Christi-*

*. Patemur enim Apostolos fuisse pares in Apostolica Potestate, & habuisse in populos Christianos eandem omnino auctoritatem, sed non fuisse pares inter se. De Rom. Pont. l. 1. c. 12.

an People, but they were not equal among themselves *. Which is in effect the same with what the Discussor says; *In this their Apostolical Commission, they were all equal; but this was granted them, not in reference to one another, but in reference to*

† Pag. 168. *the whole World, of which they were all Heads and Princes* †.

But is not this to solve one Contradiction by another? *They were all equal in Apostolical Power*; and the *Apostolical Power* (as he just before says) was *summa Potestas*, the highest Power, and contained all Ecclesiastical Power; and yet *Peter* was higher in Power than they, and had some Power which they had not; that is, they all had and had not, the *highest Power*; they all had and had not, all Ecclesiastical Power.

But

But notwithstanding all that hath been said to the contrary, the Fathers, if we may take the Discussor's Word, are plainly on his side; and if we will not credit his Word, he has produc'd their own Words, to assure us that they are so.

I shall therefore examin the Testimonies produc'd, having first premised these two things as preparatory thereunto.

1. That the Question now is not, Whether the Keys were given to *Peter in particular*, or after a *particularising manner*: Or, whether they were given to him alone, when our Saviour said, *I will give thee the Keys, &c.* But supposing them now given to the other Apostles; whether they were given to *Peter in another sense*, or in a *sublimier and compleater degree*, (as the Discussor speaks) than they were given to the other *Apostles*?

2. We shall have great reason to suspect, that this Gentleman misrepresents the Sense of the Fathers, if we do but consider that his Friend *Maldonat* (who was a little better acquainted with their Writings than he is) tells us, that he saw all Authors (except *Origen*) understood the Words spoken to *Peter*, *Matth. 16. 19.* in the same sense, with those spoken to *Peter* and the rest of the *Apostles* jointly, *Matth. 18. 18.* And by consequence, they understood the Keys to be given in the *same sense and amplitude* to the rest of the *Apostles*, as to *Peter* ||. Which being premised, I shall now examine the Testimonies themselves.

|| — Nec enim eodem sensu quo Petro atq; aliis Apostolis

dictum interpretor, Quodcumque solutus super Terram, erit solutus & in Calu; Ecu video omnes Auctores præter Origenem in eadem fuisse sententia. Mald. in Matth. 16. 19.

He begins with *Origen*, from whom he cites two Passages. The first of which he so grossly abuses, that had he to that one line he quotes, added the three next, every

every Reader would have seen, that it is directly contrary to that, for the proof of which he brings it. The Words he quotes are these, *An soli Petro dantur a Christo claves?* How from hence he can infer, that *Origen* acknowledges *Peter* more excelling in the power of the *Keys*, than the other *Apostles*, is past my understanding. But if to these we add the words following, the whole Passage is this, *Were the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven given by Christ to Peter only, and shall no other Saint receive them? But if that which is said, I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, be common also to the*

* Ἀγαθὸν τὸ πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον μόνον
δοῦναι τὰς κλεῖδας καὶ οὐ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις
τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἰσχυρὸν
ἐπεὶ ὁ Χρὶς ὡς ἐν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀντὶ τοῦ
ἰσχυροῦ, &c. Comment. in Mat.
Tom. 12. p. 275.

rest, why are not all those things which are spoken before, and which follow, common to them all *? In which Words it is plain, that as *Origen* denies the *Keys* to be given to *Peter* only; so in supposing that very Promise, *I will give thee the Keys*, to be com-

mon to the rest, he must of necessity suppose, that the *Keys* were given to the rest, in the same Degree they were to *Peter*.

In the other Passage I grant, that *Origen* makes no small difference between the Promise made to *Peter*, *Matth. 16.* and that made to the *Disciples*, *Matth. 18.* That to *Peter* were given the *Keys*, not of *ONE HEAVEN*, but of *MANY HEAVENS*; that whatsoever he should bind on Earth, should be bound, not in *ONE HEAVEN*, but in *ALL THE HEAVENS*; but to them

* Non ergo modica differentia est, quod Petro quidem datus sunt claves, non tantum Caeli, sed multorum Caelorum, &c. Tractat. 6. in Matth.

he says, that they should bind and loose not in the *HEAVENS*, as *PETER*; but in *ONE HEAVEN* †. The Reason why he made this Difference, was, because the Word is used in the plural Number in

the first place ||, in the singular in the second *.

But

But is not *Maldonate* himself ashamed of this? and does he not say, that he *lost the Truth in proving it too subtilly* †? Is not the word used in Scripture in both numbers, without any the least difference in sense? For instance, St. *Matthew* says, when *Jesus* was baptiz'd, the *Heavens* were opened ||. St. *Luke* says, the *Heaven* was opened *: Yea the same Evangelist uses them both indifferently. In the Lord's Prayer the word is plural in the Introduction, singular in the third Petition, both in St. *Matthew* and *Luke*, and in both used in the same sense. And so far were the Fathers from making any difference between them, that they on the contrary frequently express *Matth.* 18. 18. in the plural Number, and *Matth.* 16. 19. in the singular, as *Chamier* hath proved at large †.

† Notum hoc ipsum Origene, sed veram solidamque sententiam, nimis subtiliter probando, perdidit. In loc.

|| *Matth.* 3. 16.

* *Luke* 3. 21.

† Panstrat. Cathol. tom. 2. de Occum. Pontif. l. 11. c. 13.

But granting his Argument to be nothing, yet it is evident from hence, says the Discussor, that *Origen* did believe *Peter* to be more eminent, and to surmount the rest in the Power of the Keys ||. This is not more evident, than it is from the place immediately before-cited, that he believed the contrary. But suppose (as *Maldonate* says) that he was in this a Dissenter from all the other Fathers (as in many other Points he was) shall his sole Judgment, and that grounded upon a childish Error, be of more Authority with us, than the more solid Judgment of all the rest? And why should we value his Judgment in this, more than the Romanists do, in that which immediately follows, viz. That by how much the better any Man is, by so much the greater power he hath of binding and loosing, which in the Church of *Rome* is no less than Heresy.

|| *Pag.* 163.

But the Truth is, this place of *Origen* is nothing to the Purpose. For he doth not here compare *Peter* to the

the

the rest of the *Apostles* (to whom he supposed the Power of the Keys was equally given, *Matth.* 16.) but to those private Christians only, who should thrice admonish their offending Brother; he supposing the Words *Matth.* 18. 18. to be directed to those alone, who told their Brother of his fault; as will be evident to every one who shall impartially consider the place.

The next Father he quotes is *St. Hilary*. And how does it appear, that he gives a larger Portion of the Keys to *Peter*, than to the other *Apostles*? Thus, that whereas he calls the other Apostles, *Janitores Cæli, the Door-Keepers of Heaven*; he calls *Peter* by way of Transcendency, *O Beatus Cæli Janitor, O blessed Door-Keeper of Heaven*. Is not this Demonstration? It might pass for such with the Discussor, had not *St. Hilary* in another place unluckily given the same Title (and another too as high), to all the *Apostles*: *You O HOLY AND BLESSED MEN, who for the merit of your Faith have obtained the KEYS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, &c.* * What is this, but to call them all, the *Holy and Blessed Door-Keepers of Heaven*?

* Vos, O sancti
et beati viri,
ob fidei vestrae

meritum claves regni Cælorum sortiti, et ligandi atque solvendi in Cælo et in terra jus adepti.
de Trinitat. l. 6. Col. 74. Edit. Paris. 1631.

But the Discussor says, *He likewise affirms him advanced above the rest.* Advanc'd! in what? If he speak to the Purpose, in the Power of the Keys. How does he prove it? By these Words, *Quia solus respondit cæteris Apostolis silentibus, supereminentem fidei suæ Confessione locum promeruit.* But what if the Word (*locum*) be not in *Hilary*. What shall I think of his foisting in one Word for another? Was not the Action unworthy and disingenuous? in him especially who pretends so much to Truth and honest Dealing? The best Palliation I can make for him,

him, is, that he found it in Bellarmine †. St. Hilary's words are these, *Qui in cunctorum Apostolorum silentio Dei filium revelatione Patris intelligens, ultra humana infirmitatis modum supereminentem Beatæ Fidei sua confessione Gloriam promeruit* ||. How wide is the difference between these words, and those of the Discussor? It was pity he omitted the word *Beata*, because from thence he might have observ'd the transcendency of Peter's Faith. But that which I observe is, That instead of *Locum*, St. Hilary hath *Gloriam*. Now since he was of opinion (though different from all that went before him) that Peter alone at that time knew the Divinity of Christ by a special Revelation from God; what can he mean by this *supereminent Glory*, but that he obtained the honor of confessing Christ's Divinity, while the other Apostles were as yet ignorant of it?

But it is observable, that whereas he affirms the other Apostles to have received the Keys of *Fidei sua meritum*, he asserts in his Comments on Matth. 13. *Petrum fide cæteros anteisse*. From whence he infers, That he having a greater portion of Faith, consequently had a larger power of the Keys. But nothing can be more evident, than that Hilary does not mean by *anteisse*, that Peter had a greater Portion of Faith than the rest, but that his Faith was before theirs in time; the words immediately following, being these, *For the rest not knowing it, he first answered, Thou art the Son of the living God* *. But is it the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, that a Bishop hath the power of the Keys more or less in proportion to the measure of his Faith? If so, then supposing Peter had a Supremacy of Power, the Pope cannot succeed him therein, unless he succeed him also in the Su-

† De Rom.
Pontif. l. 1. c.
12.

|| De Trinitate.
l. 6. col. 78.

* Nam ignorantibus cæteris,
primus respondit, Tu es Filius
Dei Vivi. Comment. in Matth.
Can. 14.

premacý of his Faith: And I fear the *Discuſſor* will be hardly put to it, to name any one Pope, whoſe Faith hath ſurmounted that of all other Biſhops.

The five next Testimonies, *viz.* thoſe of *St. Ambroſe* (though no ſuch words as thoſe he quotes are in *Serm.* 66.) *Cyriſ, Baſil, Chryſoſtom, Cyprian*, are all impertinent, becauſe they only affirm ſimply, that the Keys were given or entrusted to *Peter*. So *Ambroſe*, *He it is that received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* So *Cyriſ*, *Peter bearing the Keys of Heaven*, &c. There is nothing of compariſon in any of theſe Quotations between *Peter* and the other Apoſtles; nothing to inſinuate, that he hath the Keys in a higher degree than they. If any thing be hence inſerr'd, it muſt be this, That *Peter* had the Keys *ſolely*, becauſe they ſeem to ſpeak excluſively of the other Apoſtles. But that this cannot be their meaning, the *Discuſſor* himſelf grants †. That they cannot mean, that he had this Power in a higher degree than the other Apoſtles, is as evident; becauſe the very ſame Fathers make him and the reſt equal in this Power. What then is the reaſon why they ſpeak after this manner? Either, 1. Becauſe theſe words, *I will give thee the Keys*, were directed to *Peter alone*, tho meant to all the Apoſtles (as *St. Ambroſe*.) Or, 2. Becauſe (to repreſent Unity) the Keys were given firſt to *Peter* only, which were afterward given to all the Apoſtles (as *St. Cyprian* held.)

That *Bede* cannot mean by the Words he quotes, that *Peter* had any Degree of Power above the other Apoſtles, is manifeſt, in that he expreſſly attributes to them all, the very ſame Power of binding and looſing, that was given to *Peter*. This Power, ſays he, *is without doubt given to all the Apoſtles, to whom Chriſt ſaid in general*

† Pag. 158,
159, 161, 162.

neral after his Resurrection, Receive ye the Holy Ghost : Whose Sins ye remit, &c. || And he says the same again presently after the Words quoted. All therefore that he means by the Keys being given to Peter *pra ceteris*, is this, that they were given to Peter first, and to the other Apostles after his Resurrection.

|| Hæc potestas sine dubio cum eis datur Apostolis, quibus ab eo post resurrectionem dicitur, Accipite Spiritum sanctum, &c. In March. 16. 19.

He acknowledges, St. Austin affirms, the Keys to be given to the Church when they were given to St. Peter*. But he cannot see, that this *disfringes* the least ray of Clarity from his Glory, but rather gilds it with a more radiant Lustre. Yea, with a lustre so radiant, that it hath quite put out his Eyes ; for he must be blind who cannot see, that this is utterly inconsistent with a Supremacy of Power in St. Peter. Not if rightly understood, says he, for if you consult his Writings, you will find the reason which moved him to affirm this, was because Peter represented the Church ; now in what Quality he represented it ; he discovers himself in his Tract. ult. in Johan, Cujus Ecclesie Petrus Apostolus propter Apostolatui sui Primatum gerebat figurata generalitate personam. And in Psal. 108. Cujus Ecclesie ille agnoscitur gessisse personam propter primatum quem in Discipulis habuit. And in Sermon. 23. de verbis Domini, Beatus Petrus figuram Ecclesie portans, Apostolatus principatum tenens. But by his leave, St. Austin in these places, tells us only the Reason why he represented the Church, not in what Quality he represented it. He did bear the Person of the Church, propter Apostolatui sui primatum, propter primatum quem in Discipulis habuit, and Apostolatus principatum tenens ; that is, by reason of the Primacy of order, or Precedence he had among the Apostles ; for this is the Primacy St. Austin means, as appears by his own Words, in the place quoted by the Discussor himself, in the next Page ;

* Pag. 163.

such a Primacy, from which not the least ray of Sovereignty can be derived. This, he supposes was the reason, why our Saviour made choice of him to represent the Church, rather than another. But to say he represented the Church in the Quality of its Prince or Governor, is non-sence: A Prince, as such, cannot represent his Subjects; nor any Governor, those under his Government. Besides, that these very places of St. *Austin* he produces, are a direct Contradiction to this Conceit, as may appear by a short Reflection upon them. The first, with the addition of those Words he hath omitted, as not for his turn, is thus in English; *Of which Church PETER for the Primacy of his Apostleship did bear the Person, the whole being figured in him. For as to what properly appertains to him, he was by Nature one Man, by Grace one Christian, by more abundant Grace, one and the first Apostle.* But when it is said to him, *I will*

† — Cujus Ecclesiz Petrus Apostolus propter Apostolatus sui primatum gerebat figurata generalitate personam. Quod enim ad ipsum proprie pertinet, natura unus homo erat, gratia unus Christianus, abundantiore gratia, unus idemque primus Apostolus; sed quando ei dictum est, *Tibi dabo claves*— Universam significabat Ecclesiam. In Evang. Johan. Tractat. 124.

give thee the Keys— he signified the whole Church, &c.|| In which Words, these two things may be observed, each of which is destructive of the Discussor's Notion. 1. That St. *Austin* makes him bear the Person of the Church; neither as an *Apostle*, nor as the *prime Apostle*; this is evident by the Words *sed quando*. He was an *Apostle*, yea the *prime Apostle*, but when it was said to him, *I will give thee the*

Keys, he signified the Church. He did not therefore represent the Church, as he was the *prime Apostle*. 2. That he bore the Person of the Church, only as he signified the Church: And has he that signifies another, Dominion over him whom he signifies? as for instance, the Ambassador over his Prince? The next place will give us a farther Proof of the Discussor's fair dealing.

For

For as some things, says St. Austin, are said, which may seem properly to belong to the Apostle Peter, which yet have not a clear Sense, unless when they are referred to the Church, of which he is acknowledged to have born the Person in a Figure, by reason of the Primacy he had among the Disciples, as is that, *I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and if there be any such like; so Judas after a certain manner sustains the Person of the Jews, the Enemies of Christ, &c.* || Why did he here omit the Words (*in figurâ*) unless because they were not favourable to his Design? And why did he cut off all that concerns Judas, but because he saw it was plainly against it? These things are here observable. 1. That *I will give thee the Keys*, though spoken to Peter, yet cannot have a clear Sense unless it be referr'd to the Church. 2. That there might be other such things said to him. 3. That Christ did not promise him the Primacy, when he promised the Keys, for he had that before. 4. That he did bear the Person of the Church in a Figure. 5. That Judas after a manner sustained the Person of Christ's Enemies; and in another place, he says not after a manner, but absolutely, that *one wicked Man signified the Body of the Wicked, as Peter did the Body of the Good, the Body of the Church**. Now will the Discussor say, that Judas had Jurisdiction over the Body of the Wicked †.

It is irksom to insist on these things, I shall therefore pass over his next Quotation from Serm. 23. *de verb. Domini* (by an error of the Press, I suppose, put for Serm. 13.) which is as little to the purpose, as either of the former; and shall desire the Discussor to resolve me these two Questions.

|| Sicut enim quædam dicuntur, quæ ad Apostolum Petrum proprie pertinere videantur, nec tamen habent illustrem intellectum, nisi cum referuntur ad Ecclesiam, cujus ille agnoscitur in figura gestasse personam, sicut est, *Tibi dabo clavem regni Cælorum, & si quæ ejusmodi: ita Judas personam quodammodo sustinet inimicorum Christi Judæorum, &c.* In Psal. 108.

* Tractat. 90. in Evang. Joh. han.
† See Ephra. c. 1.

1. Whether

1. Whether every one of the Apostles received the Keys as Head of the Church, because they are all by St. *Austin* joined with *Peter* in representing the Church. For having quoted the Words of our Saviour, *As my Father sent me, so send I you: Whose Sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c.* He adds, *If therefore they did bear the person of the Church, and so this was said to them, as if*

¶ Sicut misit
me Pater, et e-
go mitto vos—

ergo si personam gerebant Ecclesie, & sic eis hoc dictum est, tanquam ipsi Ecclesie diceretur
&c. De Baptismo Contr. Donatist. l. 3. c. 18.

2. Whether St. *John* was the Primate of the Church Triumphant? The ground of the Query is, because St. *Austin* in this same Tractat quoted by the Discussor, makes St. *John* the Figure of the State of the Church in Heaven, as he does St. *Peter* of the State of the Church on Earth.

But it tends much to Peter's Glory, that in St. Austin's Judgment none of the Apostles represented the Church but he. How much soever it may otherwise tend to his Glory, nothing of Dominion can be hence inferred. Nor is this Glory so appropriated by *Austin* to *Peter*, but it is by him ascrib'd to the other Apostles together with him (as I have shewed before.) But how bright soever this Glory may be in it self, the Discussor has here drawn a Vail over it, by making him who before received the Keys as their *Prince*, to receive them now as their *Proxy*; for so he adds in the same Page; *He received them immediately—— They received them by a Proxy, &c.* Now a *Proxy*, as such, hath not one Ray of *Clarity*, by which he outshines those whose *Proxy* he is.

When *Optatus* says, *That he alone received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, to be COMMUNICATED to the rest*, he doth not mean, to be communicated

nicated by him, but by *Christ* (as a Roman Doctor expounds it *) And the preference *Optatus* there gives to him, consists in this, that he alone received the Promise first, which was afterwards perform'd to all the rest.

* *Et clavus regni Cælorum committendus cæteris ; id est, quas Christus commendaturus erat cæteris. Du Pin. Dissertat. 4. c. 1.*

As to what he adds concerning *Matth. 18. 18.* That the Fathers expound it of *fraternal Correction*. If he mean *all*, or the *greater number* of the Fathers, it shews either his Ignorance or his Insincerity. Of those four he mentions, *Origen* I grant does so. *Chrysostom*, *Mal-donat* says, *speaks obscurely, that he knows not whether he was of this opinion or not* ; but in another place he, as plainly as words can make it, applies this Text to the Apostles only †. *St. Jerom* he palpably abuses, by quoting his Words on *ver. 16.* whereas he expressly expounds *ver. 18.* of the Power given to the Church of binding and loosing. The words cited from *St. Ambrose*, I know not where to find ; but I suspect he has dealt as fairly with him, as with *St. Jerom*.

† De utilitat. Lect. Script. Tom. 5. p. 590. Edit. Front. Duc.

The remainder of this Chapter is either ridiculous or impertinent, except that he says, *St. Jerom* in his *Comments* on *Matth. 16.* speaking of the Power of Keys, acknowledges Peter to have received it **SPECIATIM**: Which is not, I grant, impertinent, but that which is much worse, a downright Falstiy : For in his *Comments* upon that Chapter, the word *Speciatim* is not to be found, nor any other of a like import, relating to *St. Peter*. Nor yet those Words he quotes as following after it.

Proposition IV.

That by the Keys promised and given to PETER, is meant the supreme Power of governing the Universal Church ||.

¶ P. 133, 134. *Church* ||. This will be dispatched in a word: If he meant *Supreme* in a negative sense, *viz.* that Power than which there is none in the Church higher, it would be true; but then in this sense *Supreme Power* was given to every *Apostle*. But as he means thereby a Power superior to that of the other *Apostles*, by which *Peter* was constituted their Governour, so it is false. For since (as has been already proved, and as the Sorbonist before-quoted, affirms *) the very same Keys promised to *Peter*, were afterward granted to the rest, therefore by the Keys cannot be here understood the supreme Power over the Whole Church.

* Primum est Petro promissas esse eas ipsas claves, quæ postea cæteris concessæ sunt, ac proinde per claves hic non intelligi, ut vult Bellarminus, summam potestatem in omnem Ecclesiam. Ellies dñ Pin. dissertat. 4. c. 1. p. 309.

What he produces for proof, is of no force. *St. Chrysostom*, he tells us, affirms, that our Saviour by virtue of his Promise of the Donation of the Keys, did not only give *S. Peter* Power over the whole World, but to rise a Key higher, **EVEN OVER THINGS IN HEAVEN** †. And *S. Chrysostom* also says of *S. Paul*, That he took upon him the whole World: And of all the *Apostles* in common, That not Nations and divers Cities, but the World was committed to them (as we have before heard.) And to rise to the higher Key: Did not *Christ* give to the other *Apostles* the same power over things in Heaven, when he said to them, *Whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in HEAVEN*? And does not the same *Chrysostom*, speaking of these Words, *Matth. 18. 18.* say of all the *Apostles*, *They sitting upon Earth, give Sentence, and the virtue of their Sentence passes to the Heavens: As Emperors sitting in some one City, give Sentence, and constitute Laws, but the Power of their Sentences and Laws runs through all the World: so the Apostles sitting in some one place, ordained these things; but the Power of their Laws*

† Pag. 134.

Laws and Bonds, did not pass through the World only, but ascended to the very Height of the Heavens ||.

|| *Ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ φωνῇ
αὐτῷ λέγοντι, ὅτι ἡ ἐκ-
ουσία διαβαίνει πρὸς τὰς οὐ-
ρανούς, &c. De utilitat. Lect. Script.
p. 390, 391.*

He adds the *Keys* likewise, Apoc. i. 10. *signifie Supreme Power, where our Saviour says of himself, I have the Keys of Death and of Hell; by which Phrase absolute Dominion over Death and Hell are indigitated* *. But were these *Keys* in St. Peter's keeping? Had he absolute power of raising the Dead? No, he will say he doth not quote it to this purpose, but only to shew that the *Keys* in this place signify *absolute Dominion* over that which is spoken of. Suppose they do so here, what then? Do the *Keys* signify as much when attributed to *Peter*, as when attributed to *Christ*? Is there no difference between the *Keys* in the Hands of the Master of the Family, and in the hands of his Steward. A twofold difference at least must be granted, one in the *Quality*, the other in the extent of the Power denoted by them.

* Pag. 134.

1. In the *Quality*; The *Keys* in the Master's Hands denote an Original, Absolute, Supreme Power; in the Steward's, a Power delegated and subordinate to that of the Master. Thus the *Keys* in *Christ's* Hands signify Supreme Power; but if when given to *Peter*, they denote the same Supremacy, then there must be two *Supreme Powers* over the same Family, which is a plain Contradiction. Yea, since (as I have proved) the *same Keys* were afterwards promised to, and conferred upon all the *Apostles*, if they ever denote *Supremacy of Power*, there must be as many *Supremes* as there were *Apostles*.

2. In the *Extent* of the Power; the Master's *Keys* extend to the whole Family (be it never so large) the Stewards, to that part of the Family only over which

he is set: Thus for instance, the *Lord high Steward* of the King's Household, his Power is limited; he hath no Authority over the Officers of his Majesty's Chappel, of his Chamber, of his Stable, &c. Now the whole Church in Heaven and Earth is Christ's Family; that part of it in Heaven, the *Discussor*, I think, will not affirm, that it is subjected to St. Peter, but to Christ immediately: That part on Earth is subdivided into particular Churches, as so many lesser Families, over which Christ hath appointed there shall be so many Stewards, one Steward over one part, another over another. As therefore we find not in Scripture any one Steward set over the whole, so we read of many Stewards, with respect to the parts. St. Paul and all the rest of the *Apostles* were Stewards in this Family, as well as Peter, or else St. Paul was out in his reckoning, when he said to the *Corinthians*, *Let a Man so account of us, as of the Ministers of CHRIST, and STEWARDS of the Mysteries of God* †. Yea, the same St. Paul supposes every Bishop, to be a Steward of God ‖. But I need not insist longer upon such little Arguments.

† 1 Corinth.

4 1.

‖ Tit. 1. 7.

C H A P. IV.

THE next Chapter, I may be allow'd to pass over; for it no way tends to St. Peter's Glory, that Christ said to him, *Get thee behind me Satan*. I know not who those several are, that object, as if by calling him so, Christ had evacuated what he promised him before *. And he might well have spared the Pains he put himself to in proving the contrary. Nor was the Denial of his Master,

* Hag. 172.

Master, a Ray of Clarity, but by the Gentleman's own Confession an Eclipse. It was, says he, a short Eclipse, a Trip rather than a Fall, a verbal rather than a real, a labial rather than a mental Abnegation†. Of his excellent Faculty at ringing Changes upon Words! Of those several Reasons the Fathers alledge, why God permitted him to fall into this Offence, in the fourth (*viz.* because Christ designing him to be the SUPREME Ruler of the Church—that he might be compassionate and favourable to poor penitent Sinners in absolving them, &c. ||) I desire him to leave out the Word *supreme*, because it is not found in any of those Fathers he quotes for the proof of it. This true, as Peter denied him, so the rest fled for it†: But why should he cite Theophilact for this? I am apt to think St. Mark's Authority might have been as good. Nor do I deny, but it will lessen his Fault, if we consider the Dirty of that dreadful time, when he denied his Master: it was, says he, when the Power of Darkness ruled with his black Scepter; it was when the Sun was obtenebrated, the World shak'd with unusual Tremors, and obdurate Rocks cleft asunder*. Though by the Discussor's leave, it was not when, but after he had denied Christ, that the Sun was darkn'd, the Earth quak'd, and the Rocks rent. I shall not enquire the reason, why he passed over St. Peter's other Faults, especially considering, that he found an Answer prepared to his hand by Bellarmine, but shall proceed to Chapter 5. We are now come to those Words [*Fed my Sheep*] which the Discussor finds to be strongly urged by Catholick Writers (as he calls them) in Defence of Peter's supreme Pastoral Jurisdiction; and impugned by Protestant Authors with all their Force, &c. I never before heard of any Protestants that impugn'd the Words, but only

† Pag. 174.

|| Pag. 173.

† Mark. 14. 50.

* Pag. 173.

that *Sense* the *Papists* would wrest them to; which is so absurd, that a very little Force will serve, not only to impugn, but quite to overthrow it; as will appear by a view of the Particulars.

1. We shall not much differ about the sense of the word *ποιμαίνω*, which, he says, signifies to rule and govern, as well as to feed. This he lets himself to prove, both by Reason and Authority: By Authority both Christian and Heathen. He first cites St. *Augustin*, St. *Ambrose*, and *Theophylact*; and then interposing a Reason, he proceeds to *Suetonius*, *Dion*, *Plato*, *Homer*, *Hesiod*, *Cyril*, *Xenophon*, St. *Basil*. Methink St. *Cyril* and St. *Basil* come in a little oddly among his Heathen Fathers. But why doth he again prodigally expend his Oil and Pains in proving that which no Man questions? Consult all the Protestant Commentators, and see if any of them denies, that *ποιμαίνω* signifies to rule as well as to feed: To what purpose then is all this waste? I must acknowledge my want of *Augury* to divine, unless it be to let the World see what a Man of reading he is. And yet after all, let the word signify what it will, it can import no more than what belong'd, not only to the other Apostles, but to all the Bishops in common with them; for Saint *Paul* exhorts the Elders of *Ephesus*, to feed the Church of God (*ποιμαίνετε*) † the very same word our Saviour here used to Saint *Peter*. And Saint *Peter* himself uses the same word in his Exhortation to the Jewish Elders (*ποιμαίνετε*) Feed the Flock of God which is among you. ¶ Yea the Council of *Trent* (which to a Papist is of as great Authority as the Holy Scripture) after it hath shewed what is the Duty of all those who have the charge of Souls, admonishes and exhorts them all, That being mindful of the Divine Commands, and an Ensamble to the Flock; they would in Judgment and Truth

† Acts 20. 28.

¶ 1 Pet. 5. 2.

Truth FEED and RULE them *. How vain then is Cardinal Bellarmine, when he says, *That from this word it is easy to demonstrate, That supreme Ecclesiastical Power is given to Peter* †. Since 'tis certain, it is as easy from this word to demonstrate that it is given to every Bishop.

* Sacrosancta Synodus eos admonet & exhortatur, ut Divinorum Præceptorum memores, sicutque forma gregis, in judicio & veritate pascant & regant. Sess. 23. de Reformat. c. 1.

† De Rom. Pontif. l. 1. c. 15.

Now though it is granted that ποιμαίνει signifies to rule as well as to feed, yet I deny the reason he gives for it, viz. *To this very intent our Saviour changed the word βόσκειν, which implies not all the Functions of Pastoral Authority, but only what appertain to feed, for the word ποιμαίνει, which signifies both to feed and to rule* ||. For how does it appear, that this was our Saviour's intention in changing the word? Why, *this was observed by Erasmus in his Notes upon this Place*: Will he then stand to whatsoever Erasmus hath observed in his Notes upon the Scripture? If so, he must renounce several Articles of his new Roman Faith. But the truth is, Erasmus hath no such observation: he says indeed, that our Saviour twice said; βόσκει, *feed or nourish*; once ποιμαίνει, *rule as a Shepherd rules his Flock*; but he does not say, that to this intention he changed βόσκειν into ποιμαίνει: so far was he from this, that when he presently reckons up the several ways by which the Sheep are to be fed, he doth not so much as mention this of *ruling or governing*. To let him see of what force his Reason is, suppose a Man should say, that our Saviour by ποιμαίνει meant no more than to *feed*, might he not with as much reason say, that to this intent he changed the word ποιμαίνει into βόσκειν; for as he first changed βόσκειν into ποιμαίνει, so he again changed ποιμαίνει into βόσκειν; βόσκειν being used both in the first and third, and ποιμαίνει in the second Interrogation.

|| Pag. 173.

Before.

Before the next Edition of his Book, I would advise him to add to the *five Tribes*, five more; for by all the Accounts I have ever before met with, the number of the Tribes of *Israel* was ten. And that not five only, But all of them came to *Hebron*, and spake the words, he mentions, to *David*, he may find, 2 *Sam.* 5. 1, 2, 3. 1 *Chron.* 11. 1, 2, 3. And if he please to consult 1 *Chron.* 12. from ver. 23. to the end, he may find how many of each Tribe were then present.

2. He denies, That the other Apostles had Commission to feed and rule the whole Flock, as much as Peter *. For though he grants, that the other Apostles had most full and ample Power to found Churches every where, to convert, baptize, and preach to every Creature; yet notwithstanding all this, they did not equalize Peter——For he by Virtue of these our Saviour's Words was created, not only chief Pastor of all other Christians, but even of the Apostles themselves. Which because he here only asserts, but afterward pretends largely to prove, I shall therefore remit the Consideration of it to another place.

3. He next contends, that these Words, *feed my Sheep*, contain a Commission, in Opposition to Dr. Hammond, Dr. Stillingfleet, and Dr. Barrow, who affirm them to be an Exhortation: Dr. Hammond, (he tells us) says of this Text, *All that can by any Torture be extracted from it, is an Exhortation to a diligent Discharge of that Office to which he was before commissioned* †. And is that all? does he give no reason for what he says? But it is easier to repeat an Assertion, than to answer the Arguments by which it is confirm'd. But see how the *Discussor* proves it to be a Commission. *The Words*, says he, *being pronounced by a Lord to his Servant, imperatively, have no Lineaments of an Exhortation, but of a Commission* ||. Is then every Command of a Lord to

* Pag. 179.

† Pag. 180.

|| Ibid.

his Servant a Commission? A Commission, I thought had ever conveyed some Power, which the Person had not, before he received that Commission. But a Lord may I hope command his Servant to do that which he had before impower'd him to do. If this be all required to a Commission, most of St. Peter's Exhortations are Commissions, foras they are expressed in the Imperative Form; so (if the Romanists say true) he was so great a Lord, that not only those to whom he directed his Epistles, but the Apostles themselves were his Servants. But I need not insist upon this, since Dr. Hammond himself hath so fully answered it. His fourth Argument, saith the Doctor, is, that Pasce being expressed imperatively, and spoken by a Lord to his Servant, ought in all reason to signify a Command; since then every Command of a lawful Superior gives a Commission to do that which he commands, and the Words expressing this Command are in a particular manner spoken to Peter, it follows, that St. Peter had by them a particular Commission given him to feed Christ's Flock. To which the Doctor answers by denying, that every Command of a lawful Superior gives a Commission; for it is, says he, evident, lawful Superiors may command to exercise their Commission, after it is given. Is not this visible in the Field every Day? The General gives his Commission, first for the raising of an Army, then in any particular Expedition, he gives out Commands, an hundred perhaps in a Day, and is there any Colour of Probability for each of these Commands, that it should be the giving a Commission? If there be, it must be founded in the Equivocalness of the word Commission, so as not only the Conveying the Power and Authority, or Office shall be meant by it (which is the ordinary Notion) but the giving out any Order*. Thus the Doctor. I commend this Gentleman's Discretion, that he passed it.

* Dispatch
dispatch d. c. 7.
Sec. 2.

it over. I fear he will be hard put to it, to shew what Power was here given to *Peter*, above what he had before; for he was before impower'd to feed *Christ's Sheep*: Yea, I have already proved, not only by the Testimonies of the Fathers, but of *Bellarmino* and *Maldonat*, that no greater Power could be contained in these Words, *Feed my Sheep*, than was before conveyed to him, and the rest of the Apostles; by those other Words, *As my Father sent me, so send I you*, &c. The necessary Consequence of which is, that they could not contain a Commission properly so call'd. However, if every Command of a Master to a Servant to do his Duty, mu't be a Commission, I then grant that this is so.

But he finds the Fathers looking upon these Words, as a *Command, Commission, Injunction*, (he still confounds Command and Commission) as a *great Trust committed to him*: No greater, than what they believed was before committed to him. But *St. Bernard* calls it in plain Terms a *Commission*. I might tell him that *St. Bernard* uses the Word in a loose improper Sense, but I need not, because *St. Bernard* is too much a Child to be reckoned for; or rather too much the Pope's Slave, to be of any Authority in this matter. But now suppose the Fathers were all of Opinion, that these Words contained a Commission properly so called, yet the *Discussor* will get nothing by it, because their joynt Opinion was, that what was here said to *Peter* appertain'd in common to all the Apostles; and in as high a Degreee to them, as it did to him.

"*gracious*"

The first Reason he gives, why *Peter* was sorry, seems to me as pleasant and divertive, as the Reason his Antagonist gave, why it was an Exhortation, seem'd to him. I must tell you, (magisterially enough for a new Convert) he had little reason to be chearly. Why?

For

For Christ had no sooner given him his Commission, but he allay'd his Joy, by foretelling him his Crucifixion. He was grieved before he foretold this, and therefore had no Joy to be allay'd. If therefore the foretelling him this, was any reason of his Grief, it seems a Man hath reason to be grieved at ill News, before it is told him. The reasons he gives from the Fathers of Peter's Sorrow, do not concern the present Question, I need not therefore take notice of them.

That the words, *Pasce oves meas*, include Peter's Restauration to his Apostleship, the *Discussor* grants to Dr. Barrow: Tho if he fell from it, I think he was restored to it before, when Christ said to him, together with the other Apostles, *As my Father sent me, so send I you*. But this his Restauration will not satisfy; He was not only readmitted into the society of the twelve, but was exalted to a higher degree, so as to become the Prince and Pastor of that Company. This, he says, is the real sense of the Fathers. If so, the Fathers were mistaken in expressing their sense; for that this is not the sense of those Sayings he cites from them, will appear by a short review of the Particulars, which I shall now give you. After his Tears, says St. Ambrose, he is taken to be a Pastor, and receives others to be govern'd by him, who had not before govern'd himself†. What's this to his being exalted above the Apostles? Were not the other Apostles made Pastors, and had others committed to their Government as well as he? Mark by the way, That he hath chang'd *accepit* into *accipit*, *seipse* into *seipsum*, and which is very observable, *rexit* not into *rexerat*, but *regerat*, a word for which the Grammar hath neither Mood nor Tense. He quotes these words from St. Ambrose *de pœnitentia Petri*, whereas St. Ambrose hath no Tract so intitled; but the words, allowing for those

† Post lacrymas Pastor assumptus est, et alios regendos accipit qui seipsum prius non regerat. So the words are quoted by him,

Majoris in gra-
tiam reperit
quam amisit,
tanquam bonus
Pastor tueri-
dum gregem
accipit.

alterations he hath made, are in his 48th Sermon *de Tempore*. As little to the purpose is the other passage of *St. Ambrose: Petrus Ecclesia prapositionitur, postquam tentatus à Diabolo est*: that is, *Peter is set over the Church, after that he is tempted of the Devil*. For none certainly will deny but the *Apostles* were *Prapositioni Ecclesie*, set over the Church as well as he. But *S. Austin* says, *he found greater Grace than he lost* || : That's granted, but not greater than the other *Apostles* received; when it was said to them, *Teach all Nations, &c.* For before his Fall, their Commission was limited to the lost Sheep of the House of *Israel*; but now extended to *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*. Tho by the way, this is none of *St. Austin's*, but taken out of a Sermon falsely ascribed to him, as the *Benedictines* of *Paris* have shewed. *Arnobius* says, *Major gradus redditur ploranti, quam auferitur neganti*. It's true, since all that could be taken from him, upon his denial of *Christ*, was no more than was before that given him; which (as I now said) was to preach the Gospel to the *Jews*; whereas after his Resurrection, *Christ* enlarged his Commission, but made it no larger than that of the other *Apostles*. But *St. Chrysostom* says — *He so wash'd away that Sin, as to become the Prince of the Apostles, and to have the whole World deliver'd into his Hands* *. It is in *St. Chrysostom, the first of the Apostles* †, and so he was before he denied his Master. And that every one of the *Apostles* had the *whole World* deliver'd into his Hands as much as *St. Peter*, has been before proved. Besides it is observable, that *St. Chrysostom* presently after his Comment upon *Feed my Sheep*, says, that *St. John* as well as *St. Peter* received the Government of the whole World.

* Lib. 6. contra
Judæos.
† — αὐτὸς ὁ πρῶ-
τος γινώσκων ὅτι
Ἀποστόλος.

|| In Johan.
21. 23.

The reason he gives, why our Saviour asked *Peter* thrice, whether he loved him, I own to be that which is generally given by the Fathers. His

His next Assault is upon a Quotation out of *S. Austin*, and then upon another out of *St. Basil* produced by his Antagonist to prove that the Words, *feed my Sheep* were spoken to the rest as well as to *Peter*; but so feeble is his Attempt that there's no Danger. *S. Austin's* Words are, *when it is said to Peter, it is said to all, If thou lovest me, feed my Sheep* *. Which one would think were too plain to admit of any Dispute. But he fancies, that he finds something to his Purpose in the Words foregoing, which he tells us are these. *Non sine causa inter omnes Apostolos hujus Ecclesie Catholica personam sustinet Petrus, huic enim Ecclesie claves regni Caelorum datae sunt, cum Petro datae sunt; & cum ei dicitur, &c.* And what now? Here, says he, *you are to understand that in his Judgment Peter only of all the Apostles personated the Catholick Church.* And what follows from hence? *that the Keys are said to be given to her, when they were given to him.* This is that we say. O but they were given to him, as to her Head, Primate, and Rector. In this only Sense, those words which were immediately spoken to Peter, are said to be spoken to all the rest, they being all comprised in him, as their Chief. And in this Acceptation he grants, that *FEED MY SHEEP*, might be spoken to all his Disciples †. But where says *St. Austin* so, or any thing like it? He has already proved this out of his Writings. And I have already shewed that he is so far from proving it, that the places he has produced for it, do prove the direct contrary ‖. What follows next, *that these words were spoken primordially to Peter solely*, is nothing to the purpose, and therefore he might have spared all the places he quotes from *St. Austin* for the proof of it.

* Cum ei dicitur ad omnes dicitur, si amas me, pascere oves meas.

† Pag. 185, 186.

‖ Vide pag. 91, 92, 93, 94.

The previous words in *St. Basil* he would persuade us make wholly against that, for which they are by Protestants

testants alledg'd. I shall therefore set them down, together with those that follow, and then leave it to the impartial Reader to judg: They are by himself thus rendred in English; *For a Governour is nothing else, but one that represents the Person of our Saviour; and this we are taught by Christ, constituting Peter the Pastor of his Church after himself, for he says, Peter, do you love me more than these? Feed my Sheep* *. What

* In the Original 'tis constituting Peter Pastor after himself, not the Pastor, Πέτρον ποιμένα μεθ' ἑαυτον, † ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ καὶ δι-
σκήλῃ.

† Καὶ πῶς δὲ τοῖς ἐφεξῆς ποιμέ-
σι καὶ διδασκάλοις τὴν ἰσὺν παρέ-
σχῇ; ἔξουσι; καὶ τοῦτο σημει-
ον, τὸ δεῖν αὐτοὺς ὁμοίως,
καὶ λῶσεν ὡς περὶ ἑαυτὸν. Bal.
Constitut. Monast. c. 22.

is there here that is so destructive and fatal to our purpose? Does this set Peter above the rest of the Apostles? Had not Christ before created every one of them Pastor of his Church after himself? But see now what follows, *And giving henceforth to all Pastors and Teachers an equal Power; and of this it is a Sign, that they all bind and loose as he* †. He said in the words fore-

going, that he constituted Peter after him-
self Pastor of the Church; he says in these, that he conferred to all Pastors and Teachers, not a Power *subordi-
nate*; but equal to that he gave to Peter: Whereof this is a sign, that they do all bind and loose, not in *subje-
ction* to him, but in *like manner* as he. See now what credit is to be given to this Man, who can have the face to pervert so plain a Testimony as this.

That Christ spake these words, *Feed my Sheep*, to Peter only, is not denied by Protestants, and therefore all his Fathers, and all his Arguments from the Con-
text to prove it, are needless ||. But it is his way to be copious in the proof of that which is granted, and to say little or nothing to the purpose, where there is most need of proof. But though they were for a special reason directed to him only, yet all the rest were equally concerned in them.

[Pag. 188, 189,
190.

SECT.

S E C T. II.

In all that confused heap we have in the Remainder of these two Chapters, there is nothing needs an Answer, but that alone which is the main thing in Debate, viz. *That Peter as Supreme Pastor had Authority of feeding the universal Church, including both the Apostles and other Christians* *. This he attempts to prove by two Arguments from the Text it self, which he pretends are agreeable to the sense of the Fathers: The first from the Question, *Lovest thou me more than these?* The second from the Injunction, *Feed MY SHEEP*. The Vanity of his Attempt will soon appear.

* Pag. 187,
194.

1. If Christ, says he, had designed him to be no more a Pastor than any of the rest, the Question had been more rationally stated thus, Simon Jona, do you love me AS MUCH as any of the other do? but our Savior asking him, whether he loved him more than the rest, did by the Shape and Frame of the Question intend him a particular Superiority above the rest †. To the same purpose Dr. Tho. G. says, to take away all Suspicion, as if he meant not to give him an Authority above that of the rest of his Brethren, he asked him not only if he loved him, but if he did not love him MORE THAN THEY; manifestly declaring by the Excess of Love he required from him, a proportionable EXCESS or Superiority in the Power that he committed to him ||. This, adds the Discussor, seems to me most serenely to be the native and genuine meaning of our Saviour's Question, disarray'd of all Heretical Depravation (rarely elegant!) otherwise I desire to know to what Purpose and Designment was the Interrogation of a greater Degree of Love. I will be so kind, as to tell him most serenely, what is the native and genuine Reason of this.

† Pag. 190,
191.

|| Pag. 30.

The

* Matth. 26.

33.

The Interrogation is of a *greater degree of Love*, with respect to that Profession Peter had formerly made, *tho all should be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended* *. Where Peter having professed a Love to Christ above all the rest, and yet when he was put upon the Trial, having failed more than any of them, by thrice denying him; our Saviour therefore puts the Question comparatively, *Lovest thou me more than these*? Art thou still as confident as thou wast heretofore, that thou hast a greater Love for me than these have? To which he now returns a more modest Answer, professing only the Sincerity of his Love, but making no Comparison with others, *Lord, thou knowest I love thee*: As much as to say, I have now learnt by sad Experience, not to prefer my self before others, I will not therefore say, that I love thee more than any of my fellow-Disciples, but I dare appeal to thy self who knowest the Heart, for the Truth of my Love; *thou, Lord, that knowest all things, knowest that I love thee*.

And therefore that Peter loved Christ more than any of the other Apostles, (though it were certain that he did so) cannot be concluded from this Question, much less, *that this his egregious Love was the Motive that induc'd Christ to grant him this Commission*, (as the Diffusor words it;) and less yet, *that Christ by commanding him to feed his Sheep, did declare him to be the greatest Lover*. Nor can it hence be inferr'd, as Dr. Tho. G. would have it, that *Christ required an Excess of Love from him*: The feeding of his Sheep being enjoy'd, as an Expression of his *Love only*, and not of his *greater Love*. If thou lovest me as thou professest, give proof of thy Love to me by feeding my Sheep.

There is therefore no need to determine, whether Peter's Love surpassed that of all the other Apostles, since

since all that is here upon the Profession of his Love required of him, or (if the *Discussor* will have it so) the Commission here given him, does no way exceed that given to the other Apostles; so that supposing him never such a *raging, ardent, mad Lover of Christ* (as the *Discussor* very handsomly renders *St. Chrysostom's* words) and that this Love was the Ground of the Trust here committed to him, it cannot hence with any colour of Reason be inferr'd, that he was advanc'd to any the least Superiority over them. And therefore all the Quotations of the Fathers to prove either of these, are lost Labour; and I may pass over the two next Pages as impertinent, except one Passage which deserves an *Asterisk*, (had we not met with something like it before) That according to the Proportion and Measure of his Love, was the Extension and Latitude of his Power †. If the Pope's Power have the same measure, to what a narrow Compass will it be reduc'd? For if we may judge their Love, by what their own Writers tell us of the Fruits of it, in many of their Lives, there is no honest Curate who will not be admitted, not only to be an equal Sharer, but to be his Superior in this Pastoral Commission.

† Pag. 192.

2. The second Argument is taken from the Injunction, *Feed MY SHEEP*. The words *Oves meas*, says the *Discussor*, do impale and infold all Christ's Sheep in general, as well the Apostles as other Christians, all were recommended and deliver'd over to Peter's Care and Prefecture. And he deliver'd to him, says Dr. Tho. G. the supreme Charge or Superintendency of things in order to the feeding of his Flock, not only of his Lambs, but of his Sheep; in which expression all the Faithful of what degree or preeminence soever are included *. The *Discussor* hath offer'd two Arguments why *Oves meas* must be taken

|| Pag. 194.
195.

* Pag. 29, 30.

ken in this latitude. (1.) Because the words are deliver'd indefinitely. (2.) Because this was the sense of *St. Bernard*, and some other Fathers. What will not Men say, who are resolv'd to serve a Cause? Could any unprejudic'd Person have ever so much as dream'd, that by *Feed my Sheep* Christ meant, be thou Lord over all thy fellow-Apostles? But let us consider the Reasons he gives.

† Pag. 194,
195.

1. Because *the words are deliver'd indefinitely, in an unlimited manner, there being no exception, restriction or distinction* †. In answer to which it will be sufficient to ask this Gentleman a few Questions.

(1.) Whether every *indefinite* Expression be to be understood *universally*. For instance, when *Christ* said to *Peter*, *Thou shalt henceforth catch Men*, whether it was meant simply and without exception, all the Men in the World? Who does not know that an indefinite Proposition is equivalent sometimes to an Universal, sometimes to a Particular? That when its parts are not necessarily connected, it is equivalent to a Particular only? But he thinks to defend himself by the great Name of *St. Basil*, who says, *That which is indefinite comprehends all*. *St. Basil* was too great a Master of Reason, to assert that which every Fresh-man in Logick knows to be false and absurd; so that if these are his words, it is certain he meant not every Indefinite, but an Indefinite so qualified.

(2.) Whether *all Nations*, and *every Creature* be not words of as large extent as *my Sheep*? Or whether the two former (being expressly universal) do not extend to more than the later? And if so, whether every *Apostle* had not at least as large a Commission as this here given to *Peter*? And consequently, whether this Argument be not as good as that of the Discussor? *Andrew* had a

†

Com.

Commission to go into all the World, and to preach the Gospel to every Creature; but every Creature includes the Apostles, Peter himself not excepted; therefore the other Apostles, not excepting Peter, were St. Andrew's Sheep.

(3.) Whether the Flock of God be not as indefinite as my Sheep? Whether it doth not comprehend both Lambs and Sheep too? And if so, whether when St. Paul exhorts the Elders of Ephesus, to feed the Flock of God, he gives not every one of them Commission to feed the Apostles, and among them Peter, as well as the rest?

(4.) If all Christ's Sheep without exception be here committed to Peter, whether Peter be not committed to his own Government; and by consequence whether he be not both superior and inferior to himself; his own Prince and Subject too? Since he grants that Peter himself is one of Christ's Sheep.

(5.) Whether the Apostles were not under the immediate Conduct of the Holy Ghost? And if so, whether it be reasonable to suppose, they were subject to the Conduct of St. Peter. And to add but one more,

(6.) Whether St. Paul (for instance) was St. Peter's Curate? The Discussor will do well to answer these, and several other such like Questions which may be put to him, before he ventures to publish his second Book.

2. But this was likewise St. Bernard's sense, lib. 2. de Conf. ad Eugenium (he was unlucky in adding an f to Conf. for I do not yet understand how Conf. should be a contraction of Consideratione) Si me amas Petre, pasci Oves, inquit: quas, illius vel illius populos civitatis, aut regionis, aut certi regni? Oves meas inquit: Cui non planum non designasse aliquas, sed assignasse omnes? nihil excipitur,

P. 2. ubi

ubi nihil distinguitur. Why does he not say, it was the
 sense of the Infallible Judg of Controversies, Pope *Innocent III*? || His Authority
 might perhaps have been of weight with
 some who think St. *Bernard's* is too light;
 and I think it would have weighed as
 much with us Hereticks. And yet, which
 is fair, I will promise to assent to this Pas-
 sage of St. *Bernard's*, if he will assent but
 to one of ten, which, if he please, I will

|| Nobis autem in beato Petro
 sunt oves Christi commissa; di-
 cente Domino, Pasce oves. Non
 distinguens inter has oves & ali-
 as; ut alienum a suo demonstra-
 rer ovili, qui Petrum & successo-
 res illius, magistros non recog-
 noscerent & Pastores. Decretal.
 l. 1. de Majorit. & Obed. Tit.
 33. c. 6.

produce out of the same Tract from which this is taken:
 Or if he will subscribe to this one Passage in his 6th Ser-
 mon on *Psal. 90.* where after he had complain'd of the
 monstrous Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, It re-
 mains, says he, *that the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition,*
not the Day-Devil only, but the Noonday-Devil, be re-
vealed, which is not only transform'd into an Angel of Light,
but is exalted above all that is called God, or that is wor-

* *Supereſt ut, ſhipp'd* *. Is not St. *Bernard's* Authority as to this Say-
 ing, as little regarded as *Luther's* or *Calvin's*?
 * *Supereſt ut, reveletur homo peccati, ſil-
 lius perditionis, Daemonium non modo diurnum, ſed & meridianum, quod non ſolum transfiguratur in
 Angelum lucis, ſed extollitur ſuper omne quod dicitur Deus, aut quod coſtitur.*

But be his Authority never ſo little, what is wanting
 in him, will, he may think, be made up by the Testi-
 monies of St. *Chryſoſtom* and *Theophylact*, which he hath
 added to him. But the comfort is he quotes nothing
 from them, but what hath been already answered. And
 therefore (though I have little reaſon to take any thing
 upon truſt from him, yet) I will not here put my ſelf
 to the trouble of examining the Originals, but will
 give you his Quotations as he himſelf hath rendred them
 in our own Language. St. *Chryſoſtom* ſays, *Chriſt fore-*
told St. Peter great things, and deliver'd the World into
his

his Hands. Again, *Christ deliver'd into his Hands the Government of the Occumenical Church.* And on *Matth.* 16. he confesses him to preside *every where in the World.* Hence he calls him *the Master of the Universe.* *Theophylact* likewise in his Comments on *John* 21. says, *Christ delivers to Peter the Government of the Sheep of all the World.* And again, *Follow me, delivering into your Hands the whole World* †. Now in all this,

† P. 195, 196.

1. It is not said, that *Christ* delivered into his Hands the Government of the Apostles, or that he made him their Master.

2. Here is no more attributed to *Saint Peter*, than what is by the same *Saint Chrysostom* ascribed to the other Apostles (as has been shewed). And therefore *St. Peter's* Power over them, cannot with any more reason be inferr'd from these general Expressions, than that *St. John* or any other Apostle had Authority over him. For the Apostolical Commission being not limited to any one Nation, but expressed in those general Terms, *Go into all the World; Teach all Nations;* the Fathers therefore reckon'd every Apostle to have the universal Church, and the whole World committed to him: So that in their account *St. Bartholomew's*, no less than *St. Peter's* Power, was not confined within the limited Tropicks of any particular Kingdom or Regions; but without any Boundary or Horizon to terminate it, without any Shores or Frontiers to restrain it, was stretched and extended over the vast Universe. Because to whatsoever part of the World any one of them came, he had Authority to preach and baptize, to constitute and govern Churches.

This is no more that what is affirm'd by the Romanist before quoted, and by him return'd in answer to these places of *Chrysostom*, *Theophylact*, and others of

the like Nature. *It is to no purpose, says he, what some Men say, that the Sheep of the whole World were committed to Peter; As St. Leo in his 3d Sermon of the Assumption, Gregory in his 4th Book, and 32. Epist. Theophylact upon the last Chapter of John, and before these Chrysostom, in his 87th Homily upon John, and his 80th to the People of Antioch* ||, also in his 6th against the Jews: For since Peter and the rest of the Apostles had received a Power of preaching through the whole World, so that to all and every one of them indefinitely, the Sheep throughout the whole World were committed, they may be called Pastors of the whole World. So Chrysostom does not scruple to call Timothy Bishop of the whole World, and Paul often, especially in his second Homily of the Praises of St. Paul. Therefore the Sheep of the whole World may be said to be committed to Peter, because he received the Sheep, not of any one certain Kingdom or place to be governed by him, but indefinitely the Sheep of the whole World to which he should come †.

|| Chrysostom hath but 21 Sermons to the People of Antioch, and therefore here is an error in the number.

† Nec refert quod nonnulli aiunt Petro totius mundi oves esse commissas.

S. Leo Serm. 3. de Assumptione. Gregor. lib. 4. Epist. 32. Theophylact. in cap. ult. Johan. & ante hos Chrysostomus Homil. 87. in Joan. & 80. in Pop. Antioch. — Cum enim Petrus & reliqui Apostoli per totum orbem prædicandi potestatem accepissent, &c. Du Pin dissert. 4. c. 1. p. 311.

|| De Rom. Pontif. l. 1. c. 21. & l. 2. c. 12.

* Part. 3. p. 179, 198.

Yea this is no more than what is granted by Bellarmine ||. And the *Discussor* *, who tells us again and again, that all the Apostles were *Heads, Rectors* and *Pastors* of the *universal Church*, and that the *whole World* was their *Diocess*.

Having seen that the Testimontes cited by the *Discussor* are of no force, I would now have proceeded to shew that the Ancients were so far from taking these Words to contain any Power peculiar to St. Peter, that they thought, not only that the other *Apostles*, but all Christian Bishops were as much concern'd in them, as

he

he was; that the Duty inculcated by them was equally incumbent upon them all, and that they are by them equally apply'd to all, without making a Difference, or reserving any Prerogative for St. Peter. This, I say, I would now have proceeded to, had I not found the Work already done not only by Protestants, but many learned Men of the Church of Rome, particularly by *Vigorius* †; *Launoy* ‖; and *Du Pin* *. Whom one would think, the *Discussor* should take himself concerned to answer, before he again tries his Skill upon Protestants.

† Ad Respons. Synodal. Concil. Basil. Comment. c. 13.

‖ Epist. ad Raimund. Formentin. par. 2. & ad Hadrian. Valant. & parte quinta ad Carol. Magistrum.

* De Antiq. Eccles. Disciplina dissert. 4. c. 1. p. 310.

He next proceeds to *several nice Distinctions* (as he calls them) made by the Protestant Divine, whose Papers he answers; as that Christ said *Oves meas*, not *tuas*. That he said, *pascite Oves* not *Pastores*. That it was not said, *confirma Filios* or *Servos* or *Subditos*, but *Fratres*. Now though there be good reason and ground for these Distinctions, yet because there is no need of them in order to the answering of any thing offer'd by the *Discussor*, I shall not insult upon them.

He now hastens to *conclude*, but before he comes to it, he thinks fit to shew the Protestant Divine, *how fair an Antagonist he has of him*. To that end he thus bespeaks him: *If you can prove, that the other Apostles were none of Christ's Sheep, I will exempt them from Peter's Prefecture*. †. He need not prove this, to procure their Exemption, unless the *Discussor* first prove that every *Indefinite* is equivalent to a *Universal*. But he says, *If they were his Sheep, they were under the Denomination of Oves meas, recommended to Peter's Shepherdly Government*. If so, then Peter himself was under that denomination recommended to his own Shepherdly Government, for he was no less *Christ's Sheep*, than the other

† Pag. 199.
200.

Apo-

Apostles. But Christ often calls them *Sheep*, and this enforces him to believe that he meant them. When Christ calls them so, he calls *Peter* so too, and this will then enforce him to believe, that he meant *Peter* as much as the rest. But the Truth is, by *Oves meas* he meant neither him, nor the other *Apostles*, who as they are *Apostles*, are never reckoned as *Sheep*, but as *Shepherds*, and therefore not to be fed themselves by any, but all of them to feed others. Now that I may not be behind-hand with him in Kindness, but may shew myself as fair an *Antagonist*, as he is, I will make him the like offer, by which he will perceive how concluding his Argument is. If he can prove that *Peter* is none of Christ's *Sheep*, I will then exempt him from being under his own *Presecture*. Again, If he can prove, that *Peter* is no *Creature*, I will exempt him from the *Presecture* of the *Apostles*. This Argument (to speak in the Words of a learned Divine of our own Church ||) over-masters the Discussor's, because Christ said not to *Peter*, feed ALL my *Sheep*: But he said to the *Apostles*, preach the Gospel to EVERY *Creature*.

|| Conferences between Rainolds and Hart. c. 3. p. 90.

He will not yet let the Fathers rest, but summons them again to give in evidence for *Peter's* Power over the *Apostles*, which he will never be able to extort from them. St. *Chrysostom*, he says, interprets *Oves meas* on *Peter's Brethren*, which were the *Apostles*, Hom. 87. on St. *John*, λέγει αὐτοῖς, &c. Christ says to him, If you love me, preside over your Brethren. And again, ἐξουσιάζει, &c. He delivers into his Hands the Government of his Brethren *. But why must St. *Chrysostom* by his Brethren mean the *Apostles*, and not Christians in common? Why should he not use the word in that sense here, in which he does elsewhere, and in which it is used in the New Testament, and by St. *Peter* himself in his Epistles?

* Pag. 200.

files? Is there any thing in the Context, that determines it to the Apostles? Nay, when he says presently after, that *John* as well as *Peter* received the charge of the whole World, and that notwithstanding the dear Affection *Peter* had for him, they could not continue to live together, because that would be to the damage of the Church; can any one think that he took *St. John* to be one of *Peter's* Flock? But if *St. Chrysostom* when he speaks of *St. Peter's* Brethren, means the Apostles, then by a parity of reason, by *St. Paul's* Brethren he means the Apostles; and yet no Man will believe, that when he says of *St. Paul*, that he would have concealed his Revelations, unless he had seen his Brethren perishing †, that by his Brethren he meant *Peter*, and the other Apostles.

† ἅλλ' ὅμως ἐ-
σέθεν ἄν, οἱ
καὶ τοὺς ἀδελ-
φοὺς ἀπολλυμέ-
νους ὡς ἐν. In
2. Epist. ad Cor-
inth. Hom. 26.
P. 733.

He next quotes *Theophylact* to as little purpose. He delivers, says *Theophylact*, into *Peter's* Hands, the Presecture of all the Faithful. Because none being excepted, in what place soever he came, they were all under his Charge. But that he did not include *St. John* (nor by consequence the other Apostles) under all the Faithful, appears by what follows. Because, says he, (speaking of *Peter* and *John*) that great work, the preaching of the Gospel was entrusted to them, it was not fit they should be joined, but divided, that one might go to these, and the other to those ||. Again, upon these words, If I will that he tarry till I come, he brings in *Christ* thus speaking to *Peter*; I now bring thee forth to the Government of the World, and follow me; but let him (*viz.* *St. John*) remain here till I come again, and I will bring him forth, as I do thee &c.

|| Ἐπεὶ δὲ οὗτοι ἕτερον ἰσχυ-
ρῶς τὸ ἀποστολὴν, οὐκ ἔστι
ἀποτὴν ἀνδρῶν συμπρωτοχρη-
στέα διὰ τὴν ἐκείνων τὴν
ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις.

Σὺ γὰρ ὁ δὲ
ἐξ ἡμῶν τὸν
πρωτοκρίτην τὸν
ἀποστόλον, &c.

But he goes on, Besides this you will find the unanimous Consent of the Fathers, attesting *Christ's* whole

†

Flock

Flock, which must necessarily infold the Apostles, to be recommended to Peter. What will not this Man say? If by the *Fathers* he means all the *Fathers* (as by the Rules of his Logick he must) is it a sufficient induction to name fix, without an *&c.*? But it is pleasant to observe, that 1. Not one of those he quotes, says the *whole Flock* was recommended to *Peter*. 2. Those which say the *Flock* was committed to him, meant no more to include the other Apostles, than they did *Peter* himself; they taking them all for *Shepherds*, as much as they did him.

1. Not one of them attests, that the *whole Flock* was recommended to him, as will appear by a recital of them. *St. Ambrose* says, *As a good Shepherd he reserved the Flock*; that he was that faithful and wise *Servant*, whom the Lord set over his Family; that by the Judgment of the Lord the *Flock* was committed to him. *St. Chrysostom* says, the *Flock* was by *Christ* entrusted to him. And *Epiphanius*, that he was entrusted with the *Flock*. *St. Basil* calls him a *Shepherd* after *Christ*. *St. Chrysostom* again says, *That he excelled the rest of the Apostles*. *Arnobius*, *That none of the Apostles but Peter, had the Title of Pastor from our Saviour*. Where is it said, that the *whole Flock*, or that the *Apostles* were recommended to him? But I shall not pass over these without a few Remarks.

(1.) That the first passage he gives us from *St. Ambrose*, is not to be found in the 47th Sermon out of which he quotes it; perhaps his memory here failed him, for he before cites a Sermon of *St. Austin*'s for the very same words. But that I rather observe is this, that in the other Passage, immediately after the Words he quotes concerning *Peter*, *St. Ambrose* says all the same things, and more of *St. Paul*, which he fraudulently conceals.

(2.) Where-

(2.) Whereas St. Basil says only, Christ constituted Peter a Pastor of his Church AFTER himself: He tells us St. Basil calls him, the Shepherd NEXT after Christ.

(3.) His abuse of St. Chrysostom in Inscript. Act. Apost. is such, as equally betrays both his Folly and Insincerity. He says Chrysostom calls Peter the Head Pastor of the Apostles. But now if he was their Head-Pastor, he was not their sole Pastor, they must have another Pastor over them, subordinate to Peter; this shews his Folly.

(2.) Nor is the Insincerity less egregious: For that which Chrysostom says is this; that Antioch received the first of the Apostles as its Pastor, (Peter having been Bishop there) His Words are thus englished. This is one Privilege of our City, that in the Beginning it received the chief of the Apostles for its Teacher. For it was meet, that the City which before all the World was

adorned with the name of Christians, should receive for its Pastor, the first of the Apostles†. Judge now whether there was ever a more pure peice of Forgery than the Discussor's Translation of those Words. Is not he, think you, a Man well qualified to cry out upon others for culling out here and there a Line without perpending its Relation, either to the foregoing or following matter? Ends without Beginnings, Beginnings without Ends?

(4.) The Words produc'd for St. Austin's are taken out of a Book that is none of his ||, as Erasmus has proved by unanswerable Arguments. But if his Reasons and Authority should be rejected; Bellarmine not only says so, but that it is the Book of some Heretick, and proves it too*. And Labbe says, that all Men easily consent, that it is none of St. Austin's.†

† Ἐν γὰρ καὶ τὸ πλεονέκτημα
τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως, τὸ ὅτι Ἀπο-
στόλων τὸ κορυφαῖον λαβεῖν ἐν ἀρ-
χῇ διδύσκαλον. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ πρῶ-
τος τῶν οἰκουμένων ἀπέστῃς τὸ ὅτι
Χριστιανῶν ἀναδομιστὴν ὄνομα,
τὸν ὅτι Ἀποστόλων πρῶτον ποι-
εῖν λαβεῖν.

* De Scriptor. Ecclesiast. p.
161. Edit. Lugd. 1675.

† De Scriptor. Ecclesiast.
tom. I. p. 137.

Q

(5.) Arno-

(5.) *Arnobius*, from whom the last Testimony is taken, is of no Authority; *Bellarmino* hath proved, that he was not that *Arnobius* who lived about the beginning of *Dioclesian's* Reign, and wrote the seven Books *contra Gentes* ||, which *Du Pin* says is so certain, that all the World agrees in it *; *Sixtus Senensis* think he was an African †; *Oudin*, that he was a French-Man ||. But it matters not whether, since what he says is nothing to our

|| De Scriptor. Eccl. p. 88.
* Nouvelle Bibliotheque tome
premier. p. 630.

† Biblioth. Sanct. l. 4. p.
201, 202.

|| Supplement. de Scriptor.
p. 100.

present purpose. For suppose none of the Apostles but Peter had the title of Pastor from our Saviour, will this give him any preeminence, if they all had the Office and Authority signified by this Title? The truth is, the Title it self is no where given by our Saviour to Peter; he commands him indeed to feed his Flock, but if this be to give him the Title of Pastor, the same Title is given, not only by St. Paul*, but by St. Peter too †, to every Bishop. And what will the Pope get by this?

* Acts 20. 28.

† 1 Pet. 5. 3.

2. As none of them say the whole Flock, so those of them which say the Flock was commended to him, meant no more to include the other Apostles, than they did Peter himself; they taking them all for Shepherds, as much as they did him. Though this hath been sufficiently clear'd already, in that they thought there was nothing contained in those Words, feed my Sheep, that was peculiar to St. Peter; but what was applicable in common, not only to all the Apostles, but to all Bishops that succeeded them; yet I shall plainly prove it from the Context of two of those very places, which the Discussor hath alledged for the Proof of the contrary; viz. the one that of St. Ambrose, the other that of St. Basil.

(1.) Within less than three lines after those Words produced from St. *Ambrose*, for *Peter's* Pastorsnip over the *Apostles*, follow those words I have put in the margin||, in which he says of St. *Paul* all the same things he had before said of St. *Peter*. As 1. That he was also that blessed Servant. 2. That he was chosen by Christ to take care of the Flock. 3. That the Sheepfold, (not part of the Sheepfold) was committed to him. Let the Discussor read the whole passage, and then tell me, whether it be more clear from the Words relating to *Peter*, that *Paul* was infolded in the Flock intrusted to him, than it is from the Words concerning *Paul*, that *Peter* was infolded in the Flock committed to his care? yea, whether the Advantage doth not lie rather on *Paul's* side? For in saying, he rejects an Heretick, lest the Scab of one wandering Sheep, should infect the WHOLE FLOCK, he seems to imply, that St. *Paul* had the whole Flock under his care, which is more than he says of S. *Peter*. But if the Flock must still comprehend the Apostles, it unavoidably follows, that the Apostles were committed to *Paul's* shepherdly Government, and to *Peter's* too; and *Peter* governed *Paul*, and *Paul* governed *Peter*, and they were both of them at once both Subject and Sovereign.

(2.) St. *Basil* after the Words cited by the Discussor, viz. That Christ constituted *Peter* Shepherd after himself, adds, giving an equal Power afterward to all Pastors and Teachers*. And if to all Pastors and Teachers, then certainly to the Apostles, who were the prime

|| *Beatus & illi servus, qui potest dicere; lac vobis potum dedi, non escam; nondum enim poteratis. Novit enim quos quemadmodum pascat. Quis nostrum hoc facere potest? Quis nostrum potest vere dicere; factus sum infirmis infirmus, ut infirmos lucrificiam? Et tamen ille tuncus ad curam gregis electus a Christo, qui sanaret infirmos, curaret invalidos. Hæreticum a commisso suis ovibus post unam correptionem repellit, ne unius erraticæ ovis scabies serpenti ulcere, totam gregem contaminet. Proæm. ad 5. l. de fide Edit. Paris. an. 1614.*

* — Καὶ πῶς ὁ τοῖς ἐπισκοποῦναι καὶ διδασκαλοῖς τῶν ἑσῶν παύλῳ ἐξουσίαν. Constitur. Monast. c. 22.

Pastors and Teachers; and if all the *Apostles* had equal Power with *Peter*, then *Peter* had no Power over them, and by consequence they were not under his *Shepherdly Government*.

What follows next, is a high Encomium of *St. Peter*; from whose personal Excellencies, I have no Inclination to detract; though I see no reason to advance him to the debasing of all the rest. Let him be, if he please, *the most resplendent amongst the Apostles, the most resplendent of the holy Dozen*; yet to say, that therefore he was culled out of that illustrious Society, by the discerning Eye of *Christ*, as the fittest Person among them to be his *Vicar*, (as if he made him alone his *Vicar*) betrays such unacquaintance, not only with the holy Scriptures, but with the Writings of the Ancients, as one would not expect from so great a Pretender to Antiquity. *Christ* made all the *Apostles* his *Vicars*, when he gave them that Commission, *John* 20. 21, 22, 23. And *St. Paul* reckoned himself, and the other *Apostles* his *Vicars*, when he said, *We are Ambassadors for Christ; We beseech you in CHRIST'S STEAD* †. And that this Title was anciently given to all *Bishops*, *Monf. Launoy* hath amply proved, by the Testimonies of Fathers, Councils, School-men, and other learned Divines of the Church of *Rome*. Yea, that the *Bishops* of *Rome* were so far from taking it to be their peculiar, that scarce any one of them till a thousand Years or more after *Christ*, called himself by this name; but was content with the more humble Title of the *Vicar* of *Saint Peter* ||.

† 2 Corinth.
5. 20.

|| *Launoy* Epp.
parte 3. Ep.
Michaeli Ma-
rollio.

He says *Jerom* observes on *Mark* 16. that the whole Flock was recommended to *Peter*, *ut sit una Fides, sub uno Pastore*: *Bellarmino*, *Labbe*, and *Sixtus Senensis* will acquaint him, that the Comment on the Gospel of *Saint Mark*

Mark that passes under Saint *Jerom's* name, is none of his *. But having consulted three Editions of St. *Jerom*, I can find no such words, nor any like them, in the Comment upon that Chapter.

* Bell. de Script. Eccl. p. 137.
Edit. Lugd. 1675. Labb. Dissert.
Hist. de Script. Eccl. tom. 1. p.
440. Sixt. Senenf. Bibl. S. l. 4.
P. 247.

Chrysostom, he tells us, affirms, that our Saviour was pleased at his departure out of this World, to entrust the care of his Sheep to *Peter*, as a faithful and vigilant Guardian, and not only to him, but to his SUCCESSORS AFTER HIM. But by his Successors he cannot mean the Bishops of Rome only, for as he says nothing of them in the words before or after, so he includes himself in the number of these Successors, though he was yet no Bishop, but a Priest only. And if the reason why Christ intrusted his Sheep to *Peter*, was because he found him a faithful and vigilant Guardian; as he had the same reason to intrust them to the other Apostles, so for the contrary reason, few Popes have been found for a thousand years, to whom he would have intrusted them.

I have now examined the Texts of Holy Scripture, and the Greek and Latin Fathers alledged by the Discus-
sor for the proof of St. *Peter's* Supremacy: And upon a review of the whole, I think every unbiass'd Reader will conclude with me, 1. That his Proofs from Scripture are not so full, but he might have been content to have taken to their assistance, those other Scripture-proofs produc'd to this purpose by some of their learned Men; such as, *Christ paid Tribute only for himself and Peter*; *Peter alone cast himself into the Sea*; *Peter drew the Net to the shore full of great Fishes*; *Christ said to Peter, SIMON SLEEPEST THOU?* 2. That he hath not steered his Course by the unerring Pharo's of Antiquity (as he promised †) but by new Lights, which have led him

† Pag. 3.

him quite contrary to that Course the Antients steered. No place therefore is left for the second Inquiry, viz. *Whether the Bishop of Rome succeeded PETER in this Supremacy?* since *Peter* can be succeeded by none, in that which he never had. Should it indeed be granted, that *Peter* was invested with it, it will not follow, that the *Pope* has it, unless it be proved, first that *Peter* was in a strict and proper sense Bishop of *Rome*; and 2. That all the Power *Peter* was invested with, was to descend to his *Roman* Successors; neither of which will be ever proved. But now if *Peter* was never possess'd of such Supremacy himself; admit he was Bishop of *Rome*, and that whatsoever Power he had, was derived to his *Roman* Successors, no such Supremacy could be derived from him to them. It would be therefore an idle thing to insist upon this, especially considering, that the Diffusor himself hath not done so, but spoken of it only occasionally, and out of place; intending, I presume, to make this the main Subject of his second Book (which he has promised). But if he resolve to be as good as his word, and to oblige us with another of his Books, let him first establish *Peter's* Supremacy upon a more solid Foundation than he has yet done, otherwise he will but render himself the more ridiculous, in endeavouring to erect the *Pope's* Supremacy upon it.

F I N I S.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

What Supremacy is contended for; and what the Discusſor ſuppoſes, as the Foundation of it.

SECT. 1.

1. That the reſt of the Apoſtles were not ignorant of Chriſt's Divinity when *Peter* made this Confeſſion, *Thou art Chriſt*, &c. This proved,
 1. By Scripture pag. 7.
 2. By what the Diſcuſſor himſelf grants, viz.
 1. That *Job* the Baptiſt knew it pag. 9.
 2. That the Devils knew it pag. 12.
 3. By the Teſtimonies of the Fathers 13.

A compendious way of reconciling Hereticks 18.

Janſenius and *Toſtatus* miſrepreſented 19.

Four Queſtions answered 20.
 4. By the Teſtimonies of thoſe Modern Romaniſts the Diſcuſſor quotes for the contrary 21, &c.

SECT. 2.

2. That *Peter* did not attain to this knowledge by a peculiar Revelation 26.
- The Teſtimonies of the Fathers alledg'd to this purpoſe, ſhew'd to be inſignificant 27.

CHAP. II.

Theſe words, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock*, &c. examined.

SECT. 1.

- Chriſt the Primary Foundation of the Church 30.
- How impertinently the Diſcuſſor quotes the Fathers ibid.
- The Vanity of his critical Obſervation from *St. Baſil*, *St. Ambroſe*, and *St. Jerom* 32.
- Several places of *St. Auſtin* answer'd, and the true ſenſe of them given 33, 34.

SECT. 2.

Whether thoſe Fathers who aſſert *St. Peter's* Faith to be the Rock, do thereby exclude his Perſon pag. 38.

A Paſſage of *Theophylaſt* answer'd 39.

Another of *St. Chryſoſtom* 40.

SECT. 3.

Whether *St. Peter* had any Pre-eminence as he is the Foundation of the Church, above the reſt of the Apoſtles 42.

The Teſtimonies produc'd by *Dr. Tho. G.* to prove the Church more eminently built on *St. Peter*, examin'd, and ſhew'd to import no ſuch thing 45, &c.

In what ſenſe *St. Jerom* calls *St. Peter* the Head and Prince of the Apoſtles 46.

Of the reaſon why Chriſt gave him the Name *Peter* 49.

The difference the Diſcuſſor makes between *Θεμέλιος* and *Πίτρες* ſhew'd to be ridiculous 50, 51.

That *St. Peter's* Primacy was that of Order or Place only 55, 56.

The Sayings of the Fathers produc'd by the Diſcuſſor, to prove the Church more eminently built on *St. Peter*, ſhew'd to be impertinent, pag. 59. Eſpecially thoſe of *St. Jerom*, pag. 60. and *St. Cyprian* 64.

In what reſpects the Church may be truly ſaid to be built more eminently on *St. Peter* 68.

CHAP. III.

Their whole Diſcourſe upon theſe words, *I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, &c. reduc'd to four Propoſitions 70.

- Prop. 1.* That the promiſe of the Keys was made to *Peter* alone. Two things return'd in answer to it 71.
- What meant by the *Keys*; what difference between them and *Binding* and *Looſing* 72.
- Proſ.*

The CONTENTS.

Prop. 2. That *Peter* receiv'd the Keys immediately from *Christ*, but the other Apostles from or by *St. Peter*; confuted by Scripture, and by four Arguments from *Bellarmin* pag. 77.

Prop. 3. That the Power of the Keys communicated to the other Apostles was subordinate to a higher degree of it in *St. Peter*. The contrary prov'd from that place where the Power of the Keys before promised, was actually given, viz. *John* 20, 21, 22, 23.

1. That the Power of the Keys was here given, the Romanists must grant,

1. Because this is expressly taught by the Fathers 79.

2. Because it is taught by the Roman Catechism, and the Council of *Trent* 80.

2. That the Power was equally given to *Peter* and the other Apostles, is clear'd from

1. The words themselves 81.

2. The Judgment of the Fathers upon them 82.

3. The Concession of many learned Men of the Church of *Rome* 83.

The Testimonies of the Fathers cited by the Discussor, viz. of *Origen*, *St. Hilary*, *Ambrose*, *Cyril*, *Basil*, *Chrysostom*, *Cyprian*, *Bede*, and *St. Austin*, examin'd and answer'd 85, &c. Whether the Fathers expound *Matth.* 18. 18. of Fraternal Correction 95.

Prop. 4. That by the Keys promised and given to *Peter*, is meant the Supreme Power of governing the Church *ibid.*

His Proof shew'd to be of no force pag. 96.
A twofold difference between the Keys in the hands of the Master of the Family, and in the hands of his Steward 79.

CHAP. IV.

SECT. 1.

Of these words, *Feed my Sheep* 99.

The sense of the word, *nocturnus* 100.

Whether these Words contain a Commission 102.

The Father did not think *Peter* was by them exalted to a higher degree of Power than he had before 105.

A Quotation out of *St. Austin*, and another out of *St. Basil* vindicated 107.

The vanity of his Arguments hence to prove *Peter's* Supream Pastorship 109.

Why *Christ's* Interrogation was of a greater degree of Love 110.

The folly of making *Oves meas*, because indefinite, to include the Apostles, exposed by several Questions 112.

The Testimonies of *Bernard*, *St. Chrysostom* and *Theophylact* answer'd 113, 114, &c.

Not one of those Fathers say the whole Flock was recommended to *St. Peter*, whom the Discussor quotes as saying so 120.

Several Remarks from his Quotations which shew his Ignorance or Inimicities 120, 121.

Those Fathers which say the Flock was committed to *Peter*, meant no more to include the other Apostles than *Peter* himself 122.

All the Apostles were *Christ's* Vicars 124.

ERRATA.

PAGE 4. line 3. for *Treaties*, read: *Treatise*. P. 33. Marg. l. 1. f. *iam*, r. *iam*. P. 36. l. 21. f. *Petrin*, r. *Patrum*. P. 40. l. 7. f. *Baronius*, r. *Baronius*. P. 45. l. 10. f. *pas*, r. *pas*. P. 47. l. 27. after *Reasoning* put a Comma. P. 50. l. 22. f. *evanid*, r. *evanid*. P. 62. l. 21. f. *Baronius*, r. *Baronius*. P. 55. Marg. l. 5. f. *rogatè*, r. *rogatè*. l. 8. f. *ohi*, r. *ohi*. f. *Moyers*, r. *Moyers*. P. 72. l. 30. after *Peter* put a Period, and begin the next word with a Capital. P. 79. l. 2. r. *Apostles*. P. 82. Marg. l. 20. put a before *Christo*. P. 85. Marg. f. *solvetis*, r. *solvetis*. P. 89. l. 18. f. *of a Job*. P. 99. after l. 28. put *Sect. 1.* P. 104. l. 22. r. *recon'd* for 2 Fathers. P. 105. l. 25. r. *se 1st*.

Other literal Errors and Mispointings the Reader is desired to correct.

